Future of International Programs Committee (FPIP) Report

Introduction
For over 50 years Kalamazoo College has offered students the opportunity to engage with local culture on study abroad, living with local families, learning from local faculty, and on some programs, completing an Integrative Cultural Project, where they engage with local organizations on a topic of local relevance in a locally acceptable manner. With the strong foreign language program at Kalamazoo and faculty focused on a variety of international areas and expertise, students arrive at Kalamazoo College knowing they will not only learn in the classroom, but have opportunities beyond the campus to explore and apply their knowledge and interest, fulfilling the Kalamazoo College mission “to prepare its graduates to better understand, live successfully within, and provide enlightened leadership to a richly diverse and increasingly complex world.”

Background
The origin of the study abroad program began with the realization of how students could engage in the language on-site. What better way to learn French than to go to France, where, after learning about grammar, they could walk outside and speak French with local shopkeepers and converse with their homestay families over dinner. During this time Kalamazoo not only developed programs on the European continent, but also established partnerships with universities in Kenya and West Africa, where students learned the local language while taking courses in either French or English. In 1962, Kalamazoo College faculty adopted the K-Plan as a distinctive approach to the liberal arts and over time the K-Plan has evolved into these four components: 1) Depth and Breadth in the Liberal Arts, 2) Learning Through Experience, 3) International and Intercultural Experience and 4) Independent Scholarship (http://www.kzoo.edu/about/the-k-plan/). Thus study abroad, as well as experiential learning, became imbedded in the culture of Kalamazoo College.

The language and culture model of study abroad continued into the early 1990s, when the programs offered to students expanded to Asia and South America including some offered programs in English, allowing students to enroll in a wide variety of courses. During this time faculty developed the Integrative Cultural Research Project (ICRP), designed to engage students with local organizations and learn about local needs in the community. More recently added programs include several with a topical focus, such as cognitive science, math, sustainable development, and global public health.

Even with these adaptations, the current model of study abroad is immersive with a focus on language, culture, and liberal arts coursework. Students are expected to take courses outside of their usual areas of interest or focus, as only one or two course(s) on study abroad may count towards a major or minor. In all programs, students are taught by local faculty and instructors, and live in homestays or local student housing (dorm or student apartment).
When study abroad first began at Kalamazoo College, students did not have the benefit of the on-campus programming offered by the Center for Civic Engagement, Arcus Center for Social Justice Leadership, or robust internship/externship opportunities. Now, approximately two-thirds of students participate in Civic Engagement, either through coursework or co-curricular programs, and students, as well as faculty and local community, are deeply engaged in the work of the Arcus Center for Social Justice Leadership. Students may explore various career and professional development opportunities throughout their four years, with about two-thirds completing career-discovery internships and externships. In addition, in 2012, the College degree requirements changed, allowing students to forgo completing distributional credits from various disciplines in lieu of completing three “Shared Passages” cohort seminars in addition to retaining a required major, intermediate language proficiency, and a senior project. This opening up of the curriculum allows students to pursue a wide range interests, including options for new majors and concentrations, including Critical Ethnic Studies, Critical Theory or Community and Global Health.

Arriving in July 2005, President Eileen Wilson-Oyelaran made a commitment to increasing the diversity of Kalamazoo College. Through her leadership and the strategic work of admissions and enrollment, the College has become one of the most racially and ethnically diverse campuses in the Great Lakes Colleges Association (GLCA). Figure 1 illustrates the increase of both domestic students of color and international students.

![Diversity in the Kalamazoo College student body between 2006-2006 and 2014-2015.](http://www.kzoo.edu/student-life/diversity/)

In winter 2012, CIP staff noticed a decline in applications for the juniors who would study abroad 2012-2013, a trend that continues through today. As part of the response, Ms. Anne Dueweke from Institutional Research conducted a series of focus group interviews with juniors who remained on campus. This cohort also represented one of the largest matriculating international student populations at the College, reflected in the comments of some of the participants. Top reasons reported for not studying abroad included 1) wanting to take more on-campus courses 2) having financial concerns and 3) already having international experiences (Dueweke, 2013). Figures 2 and 3 below illustrate the decline in both the percentage of K graduates who have participated in study abroad and the numbers...
of students participating in study abroad. Appendix D includes more detail about study abroad participation by graduation cohort.

![Figure 1. Study Abroad Participation Rates, 2010-2015](image1)

As with most tuition-dependent small liberal arts Colleges, financial stewardship and enrollment plays an important role in all campus budget decisions. While study abroad has been a key feature of the K-Plan, financial pressures and concerns about costs have increased, even as participation rates have decreased. The College offers a mix of program types, from “K” managed programs with resident directors on-site, to institutional exchanges, and finally, third party provider programs. Each of these program models provides a different structure for the student experience abroad, with some providing...
more support (RD on-site) and others less so (exchanges), and each also has a different impact on the budget.

With all the positive changes in curriculum, co-curricular opportunities, graduation requirements, and student body, plus the additional financial pressure and goal of financial sustainability, now is the right time to evaluate the relevancy and sustainability of the current international programming model to the Kalamazoo College of today.

**Statement of Purpose**

In fall 2015 Provost Mickey McDonald convened a committee “to develop a vision for and basic program elements of a financially sustainable and educationally sound program for international engagement at K” (FPIP charge, 2015). In essence, the committee sought to examine the strengths and weaknesses of the current variety of international programming offered and also to think about how our campus today could be better reflected in the types of international programming available to students. The Committee also sought the expertise of two outside consultants who visited the College on February 25-26 as well as input from the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees.

The FPIP committee members included: Bob Batsell (Psychology), Ann Fraser (Biology), Marin Heinritz (English), Karen Joshua-Wathel (Student Development), Narda McClendon (Center for International Programs), Elizabeth Manwell (Classics), Chuck Stull (Economics), Noriko Sugimori (Japanese), and Margaret Wiedenhoeft (Center for International Programs, Chair). The charge to the committee included the following: 1) Examine current strengths of K’s international programs; 2) Identify the potential of emerging relationships for K’s international programs; and 3) Explore best and promising practices at other institutions with strong international programs. In addition, the committee members also considered different curricular or regional additions, financial sustainability, the role of technology, and other off-campus opportunities such as domestic study away.

**Methodology**

Meeting late fall quarter, the committee decided the best approach would be to seek input from various members of the College, including faculty, program directors, student development staff, resident directors abroad, CIP staff, the directors of Center for Civic Engagement, Center for Career and Professional Development, and the Arcus Center for Social Justice Leadership (questions posed to these individuals are located in the appendix B). Study abroad and away past participants received a survey with questions developed by the committee (appendix C). The committee met on a weekly basis during winter quarter to address the charge and discuss information and feedback from conversations with the various campus constituencies.
Findings

Strengths and weaknesses of current model

Not surprisingly, many respondents spoke positively about the current model, recognizing and valuing its immersive structure, the fact that students could study at almost any location and make it relevant to their major, as well as financial support for students who may not have considered study abroad due to lack of resources. They noted the impressive historically high participation rate, both overall and in certain majors, like natural science, and attributed this to most departments having built their major around juniors’ absence in fall and winter quarters. In addition, somewhat flexible options, including a program petition option (for students who want to participate in a program not on the study abroad program approved list), allow athletes and science students to participate in higher numbers than at most undergraduate institutions.

The K community recognizes the valuable personal growth most students experience as a result of study abroad, including increased confidence and maturity. The Integrative Cultural Research Project (ICRP), available on “K” programs, “accommodates academic/professional work in another language, immersion, and acts as a spring board for other international experiences (SIPs, jobs, etc.).” Many of the “K” resident directors on K’s study abroad programs have worked with students for many years and have long-standing relationships with K faculty and staff. Faculty also recognize the opportunity to continue to integrate on-campus preparation and the study abroad program through the “Shared Passages” seminar program as more faculty continue to discuss intercultural dynamics, preparation, and training in courses.

Weaknesses

Despite the historically high participation rate, some faculty and staff are aware, based on conversations with students and advisees, that the rate of student participation is dropping. Students’ desire to take courses that will apply towards their major on study abroad was discussed as a potential reason for the drop in participation (Appendix D displays study abroad rates by major). Students value completing their major (or second major) above a study abroad experience, and because only one or two courses may count towards a major, there is little progress made in the major on study abroad. Students may also see more value in “credentialing” – earning two majors, or additional minors or concentrations. The rigidity of the study abroad program structure may prohibit innovation. Also, some programs offer students “academic rigor,” while others do not meet student or faculty expectations. The absence on campus of the majority of juniors during fall and winter quarter creates “impediments of various sorts, including loss of momentum in academic programming, constraints in scheduling of courses, difficulties in filling needed TA positions, loss of peer-mentors,” as well as loss of upper-class athletes on teams and lack of continuity in student organization leadership.

Some of K’s long-term (two quarter) study abroad programs end in December or early January; while students earn the same amount of credit as if they were on campus fall and winter quarters. This results in a one- to three-month “break” between the end of a study abroad program and the beginning of spring quarter. This gap is seen as unproductive by many faculty; some even argue students lose writing
and analytical skills, but it is also frustrating for the students who feel they are wasting time before returning to campus.

Even though there is significant financial support available to students to help cover costs of travel and immunizations, and K College financial aid is applied toward the study abroad comprehensive fee, there is still significant concern that study abroad is not accessible to every “K” student. Additional costs, including health insurance, passport fees, visa application fees and on-site spending money are not included. For students who are work-study eligible, which supplements most financial aid packages even though it is not directly connected to employment nor guarantees a job on campus, these work-study funds cannot be awarded during the quarters that students are not on campus, and thus they lose a portion of financial aid. As a result, students who depend on work-study for either day-to-day expenses, tuition, or to send money to families, often feel that study abroad is beyond their financial means.

Although a high percentage of students participate in study abroad, K community members recognize that more intercultural preparation before study abroad and more integration upon return would help students understand and process their experiences better. Because study abroad programs are administered centrally by the Center for International Programs staff, advisors and faculty also feel disconnected from study abroad and are less able to direct students to programs that might be appropriate for particular students’ interests.

The increase in global incidents of violence, potential illness, as well as the complexity and trauma of experiencing and responding to sexual harassment, racial harassment or threats, and sexual assault in an international context may discourage students from considering a study abroad program. The CIP and the campus could provide more information and resources for students to prepare for these potential situations.

Faculty/Staff Comments

Faculty raised concerns about the current model and expressed desires for modifications. Comments varied widely and both concerns and desires are not universally shared by faculty. They are listed below and the question prompts are available in appendix B.

Concerns raised by members of the faculty:

- Better preparing students for navigating racial tensions (Latinos in Spain, for example) as well as sex and gender tensions (sexual assault)
- No control over quality of courses offered abroad, especially in language, which leads to problems for students going on to higher level courses after their return from abroad
- The gap between when Study Abroad ends and students return to campus is unproductive
- Students feel they have to decide between doing upper-level coursework on campus and study abroad, particularly if they are double majors
- Study abroad is not affordable for all students
- Study abroad interrupts lab research and SIP preparation
• Faculty-led programming is viewed as a junket by some faculty, especially where it is seen as replicating K in other locations as opposed to having students taught by and working with locals

Desires:

• Change timing and opportunities to study abroad to accommodate certain student populations, especially athletes and those who study natural sciences. Could there be various different short-term programs, perhaps offered in fall, summer, and winter break? How about different long-term program offerings such as winter/spring and spring/summer?
• Faculty-led short programs with compensation
• Greater faculty involvement with partner institutions
• More major-specific offerings and programs, for example music and philosophy, as well as complementary programs specific to majors, such as creative writing and journalism, marine biology and ecosystems study, etc.
• Expand beyond international, increase opportunities for students to participate in study away programs such as New York Arts, The Philadelphia Center, and Border Studies
• Increased communication between CIP and advisors regarding which programs offer good opportunities for particular areas of study
• Beyond the academic model of study abroad, more professional development opportunities such as work abroad, hands-on fieldwork, and career-related internships
• More international experiential, leadership, and service learning opportunities in which students can deepen and continue their on-campus interests
• Other opportunities outside the programmatic box that offer more focused, niche programs such as those in social justice, outdoors and sustainability, global health, veterinary medicine, food studies, etc.

Student Comments
The FPIP committee sent a survey (available in appendix C) to 306 study abroad/away past participants. Approximately 55 students completed the survey (18% response rate). Major themes included:

Academic Program

• Students anticipated “taking a break” from major while on study abroad, although some would have preferred courses more directly aligned with their major
• Frustration from the students whose program ended in December and felt they did not have enough structure before returning to campus spring quarter

Technology

• Many felt that the time spent “less connected” with K was helpful and would not necessarily want to stay connected to campus classes while abroad
Consultants’ Visit

Dr. Jane Edwards and Dr. Elaine Meyer-Lee arrived on campus February 24th and 25th amidst a snow storm that eventually led to the closing of the College on day one of their visit. Due to the weather, the FPIP committee members amended the schedule and fortunately many of the faculty scheduled to meet with the Consultants were able to make it to campus. During the course of the visit and in the final document delivered to the FPIP Committee, they reported the following observations:

- Acknowledged the significant history and immersive quality of study abroad at the College, while also encouraging committee members to think beyond study abroad as the only means of international engagement
- Confirmed a disconnect between faculty, departments, and study abroad programs, particularly around issues of advising for programs and curriculum integration
- Encouraged exploration among Center for International Programs, Center for Career and Professional Development, Civic Engagement, and Arcus Center for Social Justice Leadership to incorporate study abroad program elements reflective of goals for professional development of students, humility and ethical community partnerships, connections with solidarity movements and transnational activists communities
- Acknowledged the College should examine additional financial models for all current programs, and determine which programs align both with the Learning Outcomes for a Kalamazoo College education and financial sustainability

The recommendations from Drs. Meyer-Lee and Edwards are included in the recommendations section on page 10.

Conclusion

International Programs at Kalamazoo College 2017-2023

Kalamazoo College has a long history of leadership in international education and it continues to be an essential feature of the K-Plan. Many students choose Kalamazoo College because of our strong study abroad programs. Continuing a stellar international program is critical for K’s distinctiveness.

The Future Planning for International Programs committee was charged with presenting a vision for international programs for the next decade. Our vision for K’s International Programs is not revolutionary. Many elements of our current program need to be maintained into the future, but there are areas where we could improve. By building on our strengths, the program can evolve to better serve the current generation of students.

At the foundation of the Committee’s work are the values that, for many years, have shaped and informed international programs at Kalamazoo College:

- Excellence in program and curricular design, student preparation, support and reintegration;
• Vigorous commitment to a collaborative, and ideally, a reciprocal model for academic, hands-on and intercultural learning; and
• Exceptional accessibility facilitating the participation of all students regardless of major(s), involvement in athletics or student life, or socio-economic resources.

These values have served “K” students and the College well in the past and it is reasonable to expect them to form the cornerstone of a thoughtful and innovative study abroad program during this time of transition

Indispensable Features:

1. **High Participation Rate.** International Engagement should continue to be the norm at Kalamazoo College. Globalization makes multicultural understanding increasingly important for all students. An immersive study abroad experience educates students in ways that can’t be achieved in the classroom. Every student should have the opportunity to study abroad.

2. **High Quality.** Every K-approved study abroad program needs to provide a high quality educational experience. A combination of academic rigor and cultural immersion makes study abroad a life-changing experience.

3. **Sound Finances.** Quality programs are not cheap. Instructional costs, travel costs, housing, program costs, and administrative costs need to be fully-funded for a sustainable program. Historically, these costs have been covered by a combination of tuition, endowed gifts, and out-of-pocket spending by students.

4. **Integration of study abroad and on-campus life.** International engagement should be an integrated part of the K College experience. Every major at K has evolved to accommodate study abroad, so every student has an opportunity to complete in-depth study in a field and international experience. Many courses provide theories, models, and tools that can enhance learning during study abroad. The Shared Passages program, particularly the Sophomore Seminar, explicitly includes preparation for international experiences. Athletes can choose study abroad options that let them compete in Kalamazoo during their sports seasons.

Opportunities for Improvement:

1. **Support Participation.** While K’s overall participation rate remains high, in the last few years participation among students has dropped. Better communicating the value of study abroad and providing assistance for planning study abroad finances may increase participation for some of these students.

2. **Design programs for K Calendar.** The current academic calendar provides both opportunities and constraints for study abroad programming. Program options could be developed to take advantage of K’s long breaks in December and the summer, if financial models were in place. Aligning the wide variety of semesters and terms with K’s quarter calendar will continue to be a challenge. Opportunities for internships, externships, or expanded independent research could be used to fill gaps between study abroad and campus calendars.
3. **Examine Financing.** The Center for International Programs has been asked to expand its mission in a variety of ways in recent years. Cost increases and currency volatility are on-going concerns. The appropriate balance between what the College asks students to pay, through tuition, fees, and out-of-pocket costs and how much is covered by the College’s own finances is difficult to determine. Since the endowment funds only a small portion of costs, the trade-off between programs is a real concern. Increasing support for one type of program reduces the money available for all other programming. Further discussion should consider financial sustainability of programs and ideas for cost containment.

4. **Enhance Integration of International Programs.** Many study abroad programs are well-integrated with specific academic programs but we could do more to intentionally connect international programs with campus life. This integration should include academic departments, as well as other campus areas like the CCPD, the Center for Civic Engagement and the Arcus Center for Social Justice. This would certainly include expanded connection between international programs and the Shared Passages program.

**Recommendations**

These recommendations and our vision for international programs are based on our review of International Programs at Kalamazoo College and input from a broad range of campus constituencies—faculty, staff & administrators, students, and Board of Trustees. **Recommendations in bold represent specific items mentioned in the Consultant’s report to the FPIP Committee.**

Our vision for study abroad in the next five years includes offering a variety of programs that:

- **Reinforce** [student learning outcomes](#) of a Kalamazoo College learning education
- Accommodate a wide range of academic fields and career paths
- **Nurture and maintain an exchange of ideas, research and practices among faculty, administrators and administrative support with international partners**
- Complement the College’s commitment to rigorous academic coursework, opportunities for civic engagement, career and professional development, and social justice leadership
- Complement classroom exposure to concepts, theories and models with opportunities to apply them in various settings and locations
- Structure opportunities to examine values and perspectives of at least one other community, country or both
- Structure opportunities to identify, practice and refine skills (utilization of knowledge, attitudes for appropriate behavior) necessary for intercultural development
- Emphasize foreign language learning as preparation for advanced studies, career development, cultural learning and as a tool to analyze systemic inequity
- Reinforce structured reflection as a disciplined approach to transformative/self-authored learning
- **Facilitate proportionate participation of the entire student population**
- Nurture the support and involvement of academic and student development colleagues
• Follows best practices in the field of international education, aligning with NAFSA and Forum On Education Abroad professional standards and practices

Programs:

• In collaboration with “K” faculty, affirm the learning outcomes for study abroad programs and use these as a lens to review the portfolio of programs offered. Explore financially sustainable program options that align with campus interests (exchange with other institutions, Global Liberal Arts Alliance) and complement on-campus offerings, while considering programs that could be removed or replaced.

• Collaborate with the Center for Civic Engagement to explore international civic engagement opportunities and with the Arcus Center for Social Justice Leadership to develop program elements that connect K students to local on-site solidarity movements.

• Consider actual length of programs and explore possibilities of aligning with quarter calendar or organizing options for students who may have a significant amount of time between the end of a program and the beginning of their term on campus.

• Domestic Study Away: Students’ applications to these programs have increased in recent years while enrollment caps have remained the same. Consider various financial models available to allow for increased participation in these programs.

• Consider offering a pilot faculty-led study abroad or a short December program connected to course offered fall quarter.

Communication:

• Provide specific materials related to study abroad programs and major available to academic departments and athletics.

• Create an advising toolkit or outreach program to engage more with faculty and advisors so they may be better informed regarding study abroad/study away options.

• Better inform students on the strong educational and personal development benefits of participating in study abroad programs. Some of this informational effort may need to be crafted specifically to address groups who have low study abroad participation rates.

Integration with on-campus curriculum:

• In collaboration with faculty, re-assess how many credits students can receive/use relative to their multiple majors and concentrations.

• Examine ways to acknowledge student achievement on study abroad as a credential for students.

• Reinforce structured reflection as a disciplined approach to transformative/self-authored learning.
• As study abroad/study away is centralized at “K”, consider leveraging technology and other opportunities to engage more strategically with faculty about programs and what the CIP offers students.

• **Consider offering pre-departure and/or reintegration study abroad/study away modules as part of the shared passages seminar programs or co-curricular programming offered by other departments (for example, residential life, Arcus Center for Social Justice Leadership).**

• Explore campus financial and administrative models/structures for summer or December programs.

**Financial support for students:** While considering financial sustainability for the College, continue to investigate models that would allow for programs to be financially accessible for all students.

Proposed path to recommendations:

**Phase One:**

• With faculty involvement, affirm the learning outcomes for study abroad programs and use these as the basis to review the portfolio of programs offered. Apply for funding from the GLCA Campus Innovation fund to perform an “audit” for academic study abroad programs: working with departments and faculty to identify departmental goals for study abroad and international engagement for majors.

• CIP staff will identify more study abroad options for students and families with moderate to economy budgets

• CIP staff will develop more explicit messages about study abroad, including a variety of voices and representation of students and faculty

• Continue to investigate financial sustainability of various study abroad program models

**Phase Two:**

• Determine intersections and explore programming with Center for Career and Professional Development, Civic Engagement, and the Arcus Center for Social Justice Leadership

• Identify international partners and the resources to facilitate faculty and staff (including support staff) exchange, as well as joint teaching and research collaborations

• Identify and address current policies and practices that channel support for study abroad away from students with high financial need

• Create and implement plan for sustained faculty engagement

**Phase Three:**

• Along with faculty, staff, and students, continue to review list of study abroad programs and select for highest impact of goals for study abroad learning outcomes and financial sustainability

• Identify and implement a program for recognizing student achievement on study abroad.

• Establish plan to utilize sophomore seminars more intentionally to examine various perspectives and set stage for intercultural immersion
• Promote and administer resources for students with high financial need
• Implement faculty and staff exchange/mobility
• Build on identified intersections with Career and Professional Development, Civic Engagement, and Arcus Center for Social Justice Leadership

The study abroad program at Kalamazoo College provides students opportunities to challenge assumptions they have about themselves and the world around them. The current model, while having served the College and students well over the decades, needs to be reexamined and revised to meet the current realities of students’ goals for their education, the College’s financial sustainability and emphasis on effective resource management, and the curriculum needs for departments and faculty. Over the next academic year, CIP staff will be reaching out to faculty and departments to gather specific information regarding program models and curriculum and anticipate proposing changes in the current program offerings as a result of faculty input. We will also continue to solicit student feedback as we move forward in designing intentional, challenging, and culturally informed study abroad programs and international engagement opportunities.
Future Planning for International Programs

Fall-Winter 2015

Charge:

- Examine current strengths of K’s international programs
- Identify the potential of emerging relationships for K’s international programs
- Explore best and promising practices at other institutions with strong international programs
- Using this information, develop a vision for and basic program elements of a financially sustainable and educationally sound program for international engagement at K in the short (1- to 3-years) and mid (3- to 7-years) term.
- Write a position paper that lays out this vision and articulates basic program elements, along with a targeted set of questions we might ask a small set of external consultants who will help us refine this vision and our future direction.

Some guiding questions:

- Where should a stellar international program be in five years?
- How do we develop and implement such a program in a financially sustainable way?
- What is particularly strong now? What do we recognize now as our international programs “brand”, i.e., what aspects of our program are imbedded in the College’s “DNA”?
- What are the challenges for our current programs and models?
- What are untapped opportunities and different paths, models, partnerships, collaborations, we should explore? This could be with regard to: curricular directions, funding possibilities, exchange models, country mix, program type mix, integration with other experiential learning (civic engagement abroad, internships abroad, research abroad), GLAA and other possible collaborations.
- What new opportunities does technology provide to deepen international engagement across the curriculum?
- What are various funding models we could reasonably consider in the future? What are the potential pros/cons for each model – both in terms of cost and sustainability, but also in terms of impact on student experience and curricular engagement, as well as in regards to the centrality of study abroad to K’s “DNA”.
- Are short term, faculty led, and other models options we can/should consider and what impact would such models have on the centrality of study abroad to K’s educational model, our commitment to immersive experiences, as well as our desire to make opportunities available to all students?
- How do other off-campus study opportunities (current and future) fit in? These might include domestic study away; longer-term career exploration opportunities; other experiential opportunities off campus.
Documents that Can Inform the Study

- February 2012 CIP responses to program review questions
- March 2012 report from external reviewers
- CIP program budgets, including programs lists and costs
- April 2013 “Why We Stayed” report from focus groups
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Financial:  Catherine Bonnes
Other Experiential Areas:  Alison Geist, Joan Hawxhurst, Mia Henry
Languages Chairs:  Enid Valle, Mike Sosulski, Kathy Smith, Elizabeth Manwell, Rose Bundy, Madeline Chu
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Faculty Committees:  Planning & Budget Committee, Experiential Education Committee
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Appendix B Questions to Campus

As you know, there is a working group this quarter responsible for thinking about the future and potential of International Programs—the FPIP group. The CIP would like to invite you all to give input, particularly in regards to collaboration and consideration of different program models. Because we want to make sure we get as much input as possible, we’re asking for feedback from each division of the campus. We’re especially interested in your particular insight regarding the needs of your academic program and how students in your program may benefit by certain types of experiences abroad.

Please consider the following questions:

1. Are colleagues aware of any International Programs (different from our own) that have struck them as innovative, unique, or as aligning with the values of the college and the students?
2. With the internet now, students are not as “away” as they used to be. Do faculty envision using this as an opportunity to communicate academically with students off-campus?
3. Are some international programs better suited for students’ major/minor/concentration? What would faculty be looking for in a program that compliments what they do on campus?
4. Are there impediments toward your department caused by study abroad? (i.e. timing of programs interfere with scheduling, internships, seminars, etc.)
5. Would departments consider accepting more study abroad courses toward majors, minors, and concentrations?
Appendix C

Questions for students

Future Planning International Programs

Student Survey Data


The following is a summary of the survey given to the students for feedback for the FPIP committee. The survey was sent to 306 students. 96 students took the survey, with approximately 55 students filling it out in its entirety. The 306 students consisted of current students at Kalamazoo College who have also completed a study abroad or study away program. This consists of current seniors who participated on Short-Term, Long-Term, Extended-Term Study Abroad programs, and Domestic Study Away programs during the academic year 2014-2015, as well as juniors who have completed 2015 Fall Study Away programs and 2015-2016 Long-Term Study Abroad programs.

The survey asked the following questions:

1. Please check your study abroad or study away program:
2. What is your major? (note: if you have a double major, you may select both)
3. Gender?
4. Are you a student athlete at K?
5. If you had the opportunity, would you structure your study abroad/away experience differently? How so?
6. If you could design your own study abroad/away, what would it look like? (In terms of timing, structure, classes, etc.)
7. While you were away, would you have liked to remain involved in academics on campus by connecting with classes virtually?
8. How did your experiences on study abroad/away shape your overall academic plan?
9. How did you choose your study abroad/away program?
10. What was the highlight of your study abroad/away experience?
### Appendix D Study Abroad by Major Among Four-Year Graduates

#### Study Abroad Rates by Major Among Four-Year Graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>2007FT (Grad in 2011)</th>
<th>2008FT (Grad in 2012)</th>
<th>2009FT (Grad in 2013)</th>
<th>2010FT (Grad in 2014)</th>
<th>2011FT (Grad in 2015)</th>
<th>% Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># in Major</td>
<td># SA</td>
<td>% SA</td>
<td># in Major</td>
<td># SA</td>
<td>% SA</td>
<td># in Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art/Art History</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANSO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics &amp; Math</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Includes 2nd majors.
### Appendix E: Study Abroad Rates Among Four-Year Graduates 2005-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># in cohort</th>
<th># studied abroad</th>
<th>% studied abroad</th>
<th># in cohort</th>
<th># studied abroad</th>
<th>% studied abroad</th>
<th># in cohort</th>
<th># studied abroad</th>
<th>% studied abroad</th>
<th># in cohort</th>
<th># studied abroad</th>
<th>% studied abroad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># in cohort</th>
<th># studied abroad</th>
<th>% studied abroad</th>
<th># in cohort</th>
<th># studied abroad</th>
<th>% studied abroad</th>
<th># in cohort</th>
<th># studied abroad</th>
<th>% studied abroad</th>
<th># in cohort</th>
<th># studied abroad</th>
<th>% studied abroad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2255</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>2954</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>