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ABSTRACT

Finding Balance: A Qualitative Approach to Student Assessment at the University of Otago focuses on a student assessment tool designed using qualitative techniques to measure both student satisfaction and intended program learning goals. The student assessment tool was developed for the direct enroll Semester on the South Island program, located in Dunedin, New Zealand. The program is run by CISabroad, a private education abroad provider based in Northampton, Massachusetts. An extensive literature review, supported by staff interviews were used to conclude that a new student assessment tool was necessary for the South Island program. Balancing the need to maintain a high level of customer satisfaction while not compromising student development goals, was a key motivational factor for the program’s design. The private education abroad provider finds itself in the unique position of being heavily reliant on consumeristic word-of-mouth program feedback to drive student recruitment, which can stand in contrast to the company’s stated educational purpose and goals for programming. The fine line between the reality of the consumer’s need to be satisfied and the ideological student development goals of education abroad must be navigated carefully. The desire to push students out of their comfort zone in order to facilitate intercultural, personal, and academic growth must be tempered against the consumeristic nature of U.S. culture. The success of the qualitative student assessment tool and assessment process developed for the South Island program is a strong argument for their implementation across all CISabroad programming.
Introduction
Program Context

“Leaving home to study is a big decision. Deciding where to study is an even bigger one. Every year, students from all over the world make the decision to come to the University of Otago, attracted not only by our academic reputation, but also the unrivalled student experience we offer.” (Nicholson, 2015, p. 3) Professor Helen Nicholson is the Deputy Vice-Chancellor of External Engagement at the University of Otago, and offers this insight from her opening statement in the 2016 International Prospectus catalogue for the University of Otago. When trying to decide where to study abroad, students are overloaded with options. So why choose New Zealand, and why choose the University of Otago?

New Zealand is a small nation predominantly made up of two islands located in the South Pacific Ocean. (See map in Appendix A). It is known for its rugged beauty, colonial British roots, and the indigenous culture of the Maori people. The estimated population of New Zealand was 4.4 million in 2015 (Central Intelligence Agency, 2016). The local climate changes depending on your location, but is generally characterized as being temperate, with four distinct seasons (autumn, winter, spring and summer), and moderate temperatures. (New Zealand Education, 2016a). New Zealand draws people from around the world who enjoy the dramatic and picturesque landscape. New Zealand’s southerly location also means that the country is a jumping off point for scientists heading to Antarctica for research.

The New Zealand education system is held in high regard around the world for its focus on “teaching students to solve problems, absorb, analyse and apply information, to work with others to create and innovate”, while encouraging “students to be confident, connected and actively involved, lifelong learners” (New Zealand Education, 2016b). This approach to pedagogy and student learning can be seen at all levels of education in New Zealand.
There are eight universities in the New Zealand system of higher education. They are all currently recognized in the QS World University Rankings. New Zealand universities rank in the world’s top 100 for many academic disciplines. A strong higher education system is a major draw for international students. In the 2015/16 QS World rankings, the University of Otago ranks number 173. Otago also ranks in the top 100 in nine academic fields. (Top Universities, 2016)

The University of Otago is located on the South Island of New Zealand, in the city of Dunedin. “Dunedin is New Zealand's city of the south. Known as the Edinburgh of New Zealand, it wears its Scottish heritage with pride. Surrounded by dramatic hills and at the foot of a long harbour, Dunedin is one of the best-preserved Victorian and Edwardian cities in the Southern Hemisphere” (New Zealand Education, 2016c). Dunedin has a college town feel with a population of approximately 121,000 inhabitants. Indeed, Dunedin is the University of Otago. Being located on the South Island, the natural beauty and adventure offered by New Zealand is at your fingertips, with world class skiing, hiking, kayaking and climbing a short distance away (New Zealand Education, 2016d).

The University of Otago was founded in 1869, making it the oldest university in New Zealand. The university officially opened in 1871 with just three professors on a 100,000 acre land endowment provided by the government (University of Otago, 2016a). The university has expanded greatly from its humble beginnings and currently enrolls more than 20,000 students, with almost 2,700 of those students originating from more than 100 different nations around the globe (University of Otago, 2016b). (See Appendix B).

The proposed program at the University of Otago desires to build upon the existing program already in place at CISabroad. CIS is an education abroad program provider, also called a third party provider. Program providers may be non-profit organizations, a university either in
the U.S. or abroad, or a private company. Providers act as the middle man between institutions of higher education and play the role of subcontractor. They allow universities and colleges to expand their program portfolios without needing all the resources necessary for that larger portfolio. Providers have their own on-site and domestic staff that work with students. They perform a great deal of logistical work including student registration, enrollment, travel, orientation, housing, and health and safety. By not needing staff and resources in-house, universities and colleges can offer a much greater depth and variety of program options for their students, without the burdensome overhead (Gorlewski, 2014, p. 388). The services offered by providers are important for schools that have students who may want to participate in a program that is located in a less traditional education abroad location, and is thus not feasible for the home institution to provide itself.

CISabroad is a for-profit education abroad provider based out of Northampton, Massachusetts. The company offers programming in 21 different countries for varying lengths of time. Students may choose to directly enroll at a host institution through CIS for an academic year, or a semester. CISabroad also offers short term direct enroll programming in the summer or for a January term. Most programs offered by CISabroad are direct enroll, where the student directly enrolls at a host university and attends classes with host country and other international students.

**Program Rationale**

The Semester on the South Island program at the University of Otago will be offered through CISabroad. While the framework for this direct enrollment program already exists, there is much room for improvement, especially in the development of program goals and objectives and the corresponding system of assessment and evaluation for both the program and its
participants. The strong focus of this program proposal will be on the design and implementation of an improved assessment and evaluation system.

New Zealand was chosen as the program location for a few of reasons. The country has a well-regarded education system and world class universities that are very open to hosting international students. New Zealand is a safe, beautiful country with a rich history and strong connection to that history. CISabroad and the University of Otago have a healthy relationship and the company has excellent on-site staffing in place to implement a new student assessment tool and a revised cultural curriculum. According to the most recent release of student study abroad data from the IIE Open Doors report, New Zealand is a top 25 destination for U.S. study abroad students, with numbers increasing from 2,793 students in 2012/2013 to 3,021 students in 2013/14 (See Appendix C). Student and university interest in education abroad programming in New Zealand also made it an attractive option for this program proposal.

The motivation behind improving the current program at the University of Otago in New Zealand originates from the time I spent working as an intern at CISabroad in 2015, and the work that I performed on program assessment and evaluation there. Assessment and evaluation are critical for determining the degree of program success. They are also resource intensive, and all too often, not conducted for this reason. Even when assessment and evaluation are performed, they are often not performed correctly and do not measure predetermined outcomes, derived from concrete objectives. Program assessment and evaluation are both linked to many aspects of programming, and to improve program assessment and evaluation, one must improve programming on the whole, by means of more thoughtful goals and objectives.

The current system of student assessment and evaluation at CISabroad was not providing the type of feedback that many within the company found to be useful and there was no process
for CIS staff to assess their own programs. Therefore, a new design for tools and process was important to many within the organization. The student assessment tool had questions that were often vague and solicited generalized answers from participants that did not adequately define program issues. The student assessment was also asking questions that were mostly based on customer satisfaction outcomes, with little attention paid to the developmental and learning goals for program participants. For these reasons, it was rationalized that a new student assessment tool and an overall process of program assessment and evaluation was needed.

**Literature Review**

Assessment and evaluation are important for any institution, organization, company, or individual who wishes to better understand whether desired outcomes are being reached in relation to a set of pre-determined goals and objectives. For institutions of higher education, education abroad offices, and third party providers of education abroad, there are many reasons to conduct assessment and evaluation. For an institution, it may be performed to acquire accreditation from a regional governing accreditation board, or to gauge how well a campus wide initiative is being implemented. Academic departments within a university may want to assess and evaluate faculty or curriculum to look at how well student learning goals are being achieved, or how well a faculty member is performing in their role as an educator.

One of the most important reasons that an education abroad office or a third party provider may want to conduct assessment and evaluation is for the “very survival of services, programs, and facilities” (Upcraft, 2003, p. 58). Assessment and evaluation are often performed to ensure that a program is still viable and meeting the needs of the institution, the students, or in the case of CISabroad, the company. For a private provider, the question of cost-effectiveness is important. If a program is not cost-effective, then perhaps those resources may be better spent
elsewhere. Regardless of the reason, the best way to determine whether a program is still feasible, and meeting desired goals, is through assessment and evaluation.

Third party providers and education abroad offices often perform assessment and evaluation to measure the quality of programs they run. They perform assessment and evaluation to see if students are acquiring the intercultural competencies that a program sets out to achieve. It’s possible they want to measure how satisfied program participants were with the international experience, and see if there is room for improvement in the level of service their students are receiving. These last two sentences are important. They are part of the reason for the program assessment and evaluation outlined in this proposal.

In education abroad today, there is a desire for students to become globally engaged citizens who develop intercultural competencies as a result of their international experience. This helps validate the education abroad profession, and is a good selling point for the international experience. While gaining intercultural competencies is the ideological foundation for sending students abroad to live and study, in today’s world, there is also a need to keep students satisfied as consumers. Education abroad can often be seen as an add-on to a college education, and not a necessity. Since the international experience is not required to attain a college degree, ensuring student satisfaction is essential to keeping education abroad offices in business, and even more essential to private providers, who rely on positive word-of-mouth to continue attracting new program participants.

This conflict of interest, so to speak, is made incredibly evident by Lilli Engle in her opening plenary speech at the Forum on Education Abroad National Conference in 2013, where she states “our [the field of education abroad] aspirations are weighed down by deeply rooted consumer values, tacit agreements, let’s call them, which are abundantly visible throughout the
wider American educational system but which, arguably, do not serve desirable learning outcomes in study abroad” (Engle, 2013, p. 9) The idea of consumerism in education abroad and the unique role it plays for the private provider will be important to keep in mind going forward.

**Assessment and Evaluation**

In order to examine the theory behind student assessment and evaluation, it is important to define the key aspects of assessment and evaluation. It is also important to disseminate what exactly is meant when using terminology such as assessment, evaluation, qualitative, and quantitative. The following review of theoretical literature on assessment and evaluation will provide a backbone for the focus of this program proposal. It will give definitions in context to education abroad, and discuss current debates which swirl around what international educators currently assess and evaluate, and how they assess and evaluate.

There is ambiguity when defining the terms assessment and evaluation, definitions changing from source to source. This is partially due to the strong similarity between the two terms and the ability to use them interchangeably. Finding agreement in the meaning of assessment can be difficult. In *Demystifying Assessment*, Barbara Gross Davis (1989) classically states that, “despite increasing nationwide attention to the topic of assessment, there is not consensus on exactly what topics and processes assessment comprises” (p. 46).

If you were to look up definitions for both assessment and evaluation, you would find that a number of arguments are made for how they are different, or the same. Given the myriad of definitions for both assessment and evaluation, and the confusion often created when combined with evaluation, it is important to look at some current and past definitions.

In *Assessment in Student Affairs*, Upcraft and Schuh (1996) classically define assessment as “any effort to gather, analyze, and interpret evidence, which describes institutional, divisional, or agency effectiveness” (p. 18). For Upcraft and Schuh, assessment is the process from which
evaluation is conducted. Evaluation, on the other hand, is defined as “any effort to use assessment evidence to improve institutional, departmental, divisional, institutional effectiveness” (Upcraft & Schuh, 1996, p. 19). From these two definitions, it is possible to infer that assessment and evaluation are intrinsically linked and not mutually exclusive.

In the Handbook for the Effective Design and Implementation of Qualitative Assessment by Lilli Engle and Patricia Martin (2010), assessment is defined as “the collection of statistical data on individual performance or from individual activities” (p. 8), while evaluation is defined as, “the interpretation or analysis of scores and statistics, along with other types of information, in order to formulate a judgment or conclusion about the value, quality, merit, etc. of whatever is being evaluated” (p. 8). These definitions fall in line with the 1996 definitions offered to us by Upcraft and Schuh. Assessment is the means by which data is collected, while evaluation is the process of interpreting the data which is collected through the assessment process. Assessment and evaluation can be defined as a cyclical process. These are the definitions that will be used going forward.

The idea of assessment being the collection of data, while evaluation being the interpretation of that collected data, creates what is called a feedback loop. Edith Kealey (2010) explains in Assessment and Evaluation in Social Work Education, that a feedback loop is defined as a “mechanism through which information is presented, analyzed, and incorporated into future actions” (p. 65). The feedback loop for student assessment and evaluation, as it pertains to this proposal will look just as you may think it would, as a circular process that creates a closed system or circuit. As Engle explains in The Rewards of Qualitative Assessment Appropriate to Study Abroad, the loop begins with the stated intention of the program, most often seen in a mission statement. It continues through the program implementation and ends with the results.
derived from the program, which are then assessed and evaluated. Once the assessment and evaluation process are completed, the mission statement is amended and the process starts over again in full. (Engle, 2013, p. 119) (See the visual representation of this cycle in Appendix D)

When collecting data for evaluation, it is important to differentiate between different data types. This is because different types of data are better suited for different types of assessment and evaluation. Data can come in two forms, quantitative and qualitative. Quantitative data is objective in nature, numerical in form, and seeks to measure something tangible in value. Qualitative data in assessment and evaluation is the opposite. It seeks to gather subjective data that has intangible characteristics and is often personal judgement (Engle, 2013, p. 115). Engle (2013) also states in *The Rewards of Qualitative Assessment Appropriate to Study Abroad*, that “unlike quantitative data, qualitative evaluations solicit judgment or conclusions about the value or merit of whatever performance, places, or events are targeted for review. For those who resist the notion that all aspects of complex human experience can be quantifiably measured, qualitative questioning brings welcome context to the quantifiable data by gathering valuable subjective student feedback” (p. 115). In other words, not everything can be measured with numbers, nor should it be measured in numbers. There is an important role for qualitative data in the world of education abroad, a field that struggles to measure intercultural gains, and deals in the intangible and the unquantifiable effects of the international experience

Another aspect of assessment and evaluation that must be touched upon for the purposes of this proposal is the idea of formative versus summative assessment and evaluation. It is possible to differentiate between the two by determining at which point in a program an assessment and the subsequent evaluation takes place. “Formative activities are developmental analyses of gaps between current performance and expected performance… Summative activities
generally occur at the end of a course and provide an overall accounting of performance (Kealey, 2010, p. 66).

Kealey explains that formative assessment and evaluation takes place while a program or course is underway. The benefit of formative assessment is the ability to take action to implement change in real time. In contrast, summative assessment and evaluation occurs at the conclusion of a program or course, thus only giving the individual or organization the ability to implement changes in the next iteration. It is important to note that it is possible to have both formative and summative assessments and evaluations in a program, and having both bolsters the individual or organizations ability to implement effective change. While formative assessment and evaluation are important for keeping one’s finger on the pulse of a program, many institutions and organizations opt for only a summative assessment and evaluation upon the completion of a program, due to budget and resource constraints.

**Conflicting Models of Assessment and Evaluation**

In *The Rewards of Qualitative Assessment Appropriate to Study Abroad*, Lilli Engle describes two different models of assessment in the field of education abroad. To paraphrase, Engle says the profession moves between a static model focused on what is familiar, established, and comfortable for the student. This model is customer-satisfaction centered and based in large part on expectations and standards derived from the home institution. In contrast, the dynamic model incorporates the different, the foreign, and the sometimes uncomfortable (Engle, 2013, p.114). This foreign and different is what provides students the necessary tools for intrapersonal, interpersonal, and academic development. Study abroad is the uncomfortable. It is the reason a student decides to study in Peru instead of in Pittsburgh. “Treating students as paying customers with needs is to deprive them of unfamiliarity and ambiguity, the troubling interaction with which is the heart of the successful sojourn” (J. Engle & L. Engle, 2003, p. 6)
Engle argues that, “the reluctance to challenge students with difference, at the risk of making them unhappy, has generated a culture of incompatible goals and mixed messages – an ideological tug of war” (Engle, 2013, p. 111). These mixed messages arise from the two conflicting ideologies. The consumer based ideology, which focuses on the customer, and the educational-based ideology, which focuses on the educational goals of a program.

Incompatible goals occur when the field of education abroad marginalizes the very goal that it sets out to accomplish, a transformative learning experience, by pandering to student satisfaction. “In theory, the field of study abroad aspires towards providing a change in learning environment and subsequent transformational learning. In reality… consumer contentment, satisfaction-based end-of-program questionnaires refer students back to their pre-departure expectations”, and as a result, “students are called upon to examine the quality of their term abroad through the lens of accepted American standards” (Engle, 2013, p. 113-114).

The basic question now presents itself, how should the field of education abroad be assessing and evaluating their programs and participants. What are the true goals of the field and the profession? Is the mission of education abroad to provide all the creature-comforts of home or to push students out of their comfort zones and facilitate an experience that fosters personal, cognitive, and intercultural growth? Is the bottom line the most important goal, student numbers and revenue? These starkly different goals for education abroad and this “ideological tug-of-war” is played out at varying levels in different institutions across the country, but it may not be more pronounced than in the world of the third party provider.

**Consumer Goals versus Educational Goals**

“One does not have to be a cynic to see that the values of U.S. consumer culture, and the ways that these values have come to permeate U.S. higher education, are creating high expectations about the kinds of support that U.S. students believe they need” (Van de Berge,
It may also not be surprising that “students often have a tough time adjusting to learning environments abroad that provide considerably less, or simply different and less recognizable forms of support, or that they complain loudly to study abroad professionals when they do not get the support that they think they need” (Van de Berge, 2007, p. 395) Dictated by the current consumer culture of the U.S., it is no surprise that students may sometimes place unrealistic expectations on education abroad. It should also not be shocking that the field of education abroad has capitulated to student demands for an environment more familiar to their home institutional setting and the comforts that come with that environment.

Education abroad has seen rapid expansion in recent years, “but such growth has ushered in another, questionable, trend. With the rapid increase in student numbers has come the influence of the market place. We speak more openly now of the “industry” of study abroad and, in good consumer fashion, program success and longevity rely more heavily on student “word-of-mouth” support than on considered professional recommendations” (Engle, 2013, p. 111) This trend in education abroad for consumerism and the reliance on “word-of-mouth”, has led to many programs sacrificing their educational goals in order to keep students content, and as a result, they are less challenged by the environment they find themselves immersed in. This trend is apparent in the way the field currently practices student assessment and evaluation. Customer satisfaction is assessed with the program experience acting as the product.

There are three common traps which program and student assessment and evaluation fall into today according to Engle and Martin in the Handbook for the Effective Design and Implementation of Qualitative Assessment. They are the indulgence in consumerism, the reliance on qualitative terms which are not properly framed, and the over solicitation of negative judgement. (Engle & Martin, 2010, p.4) These three traps are something that can be difficult to
avoid. It can be argued that these pitfalls are inevitable when it comes to assessment and evaluation in context to the third party provider. Providers walk a much finer line between consumerism and education in program design and implementation, than does a university education abroad office.

The indulgence in consumerism speaks to the need to assess and evaluate student programming with the student’s satisfaction most in mind. A for-profit company like CISabroad needs to have students participate in their programs, otherwise they cease to be a company. CIS is a business, and as such, needs to have customers. It comes back to the “word-of-mouth”. Poor student feedback can sink a program, and a company. Word-of-mouth is essential for recruiting new students to participate in future programs. An unsatisfied student will create an unsatisfied education abroad office. Third party providers rely on education abroad offices and advisors for relaying information about programming to new students, and if the advisor hears too much negative feedback about a provider, they are likely to look elsewhere. There are plenty of providers, thus the need to indulge in consumerism is critical for the private provider to keep students and their universities happy, and to keep new students enrolling in programs.

The second trap commonly associated with student assessment and evaluation is the use of qualitative terms that have not been put into the proper context. When questions are not framed correctly, the student is left to compare the experience with what they know, which often times is the standards of the home institution, which can be far different from the standards in foreign country. The problem is that by definition an education abroad experience is different from that of the home institution. Spending a semester abroad is supposed to be different, otherwise, why spend the time and money to participate in such a program? The process of
individual growth and personal development comes from the challenge of the different and the unknown.

Another problem with the use of questions that are not properly framed to the intercultural experience, is that they “essentially empower students to respond as designated agents of quality control. In doing so, they advance evaluative criteria rooted in American ethnocentric norms instead of echoing the mission of international education and giving value to the integration of wider perspectives” (Engle and Martin, 2010, p. 3). Is the student really the best agent to judge all aspects of program quality? Do they have the background and know-all to understand the reasoning behind all program components? These are interesting questions to ask and most education abroad professionals would agree that students should not be the ones dictating the terms of quality in programming.

The third and final trap acknowledged by Engle and Martin is that of soliciting negative judgement. Often times, in student assessment and evaluation, the types of questions that education abroad professionals ask, and the manner which these questions are asked, give students the ability to fixate on negative memories from the experience and it invites criticism (Engle and Martin, 2010, p. 3). This can be seen in questions that ask students to talk about the least desirable part of their experience, for example, what was best/worst thing about your housing? When the door to negative aspects of the experience is opened, often times, international educators can get more than they bargain for in the response.

In these moments, any and all negative thoughts can come pouring out, whether warranted or not. Triggered by a question worded in a way that solicits a negative response, students may begin to fixate on all the bad experiences, instead of the good. This being said, it is important to find out whether a program is truly failing in some aspect. If the housing is terrible,
the provider should know about it. What is not desirable is student feedback that states the housing was terrible because it is different from their home institution. A 300 year old building in Florence, Italy will surely be vastly different from a three year old dorm at Ohio University. In this case, different doesn’t mean bad it only means different, and that’s a distinction that properly phrased questions will elicit from students.

A New Approach

“For much of its history, people in the field of study abroad have been primarily concerned with program management issues such as staffing, coordination, and leadership. Concerns about students were primarily related to recruiting, arranging activities, and ensuring their safety. Relatively little attention was given to learning outcomes” (Wong, 2015, p. 121). While no one will argue the importance of safety, appropriate staffing, and providing extracurricular activities to students who study abroad, the responsibility of education abroad professionals goes much further than this. There is a responsibility for international educators “to assess the outcomes of education abroad experiences to determine exactly what our students are learning while abroad and how effective our programs are in achieving stated learning outcomes (Deardorff, 2009, p. 346).

Program assessment and evaluation often relies on student feedback, and sometimes only on student feedback. When building student assessment and evaluation tools it's important to first determine the goals and objectives of the program and for the student. In other words, what is being measured? “If well designed, qualitative questionnaires can provide valuable insights into the depth and dynamic of student-learning and personal growth... If, on the other hand, such questionnaires are conceived to evaluate a wide variety of programs, they can do little more than repose on one-size-fits-all… based inevitably on student satisfaction and/or the subjective
comparison of the academic experience abroad with that of the home university campus” (Engle & Martin, 2010, p. 3).

While in the most ideal situation, program assessment and evaluation would focus entirely on developmental and cognitive gains made by the student, in reality, most program assessment and evaluation focus heavily around student satisfaction. Is it possible to stop measuring customer (student) satisfaction in programming? The answer to that is no, especially in the case of the third party provider, who rely on happy students to keep the business alive. Does this mean that education abroad, and more precisely, third party providers should not attempt to measure student development gains from their education abroad experience? The answer to this question is also no. So, what are some ways that the three common traps in student assessment and evaluation, according to Engle and Martin, can be avoided? Once again, *Handbook for the Effective Design and Implementation of Qualitative Assessment* offers insight that can help the field of education abroad avoid the pitfalls of indulgence in consumerism, unframed qualitative terms, and the overt solicitation of negative judgement.

It all starts with how student assessment tools are designed. Since all three common traps in student assessment, according to Engle and Martin, can be linked to the questions asked in end of program surveys, it is important to change how the line of inquiry is built. One important way of combating the indulgence in consumerism in student assessment surveys is to challenge the student to take responsibility and to own their experience. After all, education abroad providers cannot guarantee that a student will have an exceptional experience, they can only act as a guide, and give support when needed. So, when questions lay more responsibility on the student for their own experience, the dynamics of the program change. “Instead of being called upon to consumeristically judge the “quality” of services rendered, students benefit fully if they are
guided to assume responsibility for their learning and for their experience as a whole” (Engle & Martin, 2010, p 42).

Engle reinforces this idea of student responsibility in her 2013 article, *The Rewards of Qualitative Assessment Appropriate to Study Abroad*, by saying “no assessment effort can be fair or complete without integrating the consideration of student responsibility into the learning process… In this context, students may logically be called upon to assess qualitatively their own motivation, attitude, investment, academic performance, or ability to take risks—to assess, in essence, what they themselves brought to their experience” (p. 122). Promoting student responsibility for their own experience creates accountability, which can mitigate the desire to reflect negatively upon the program, the provider, and the entire experience. It decreases the importance of consumer driven standards which are too often not realistic in the education abroad context. For this reason, “no assessment effort can be fair or complete without integrating the consideration of student responsibility into the learning process” (Engle, 2013, p. 122).

Properly framed qualitative questions can increase student responsibility while decreasing the overt solicitation of negative feelings towards an education abroad experience. When the appropriate context for student assessment questions is provided, it allows students to “validate the sometimes difficult adaptation to difference, and acknowledge their own actions as contributing to the quality of their experience” (Engle & Martin, 2010, p. 6). Well-framed questions also provide students a platform for student reflection. This can help increase ownership of the experience and decrease unqualified negative judgment, while helping students put into words the learning and growth that took place during their time abroad.

“Offering a valuable moment of reflection, qualitative questions determine by what criteria the students evaluate their experience; in so doing, they guide the selective process of
memory and fix in words and thought and feeling the students’ interpretation of the abroad experience itself” (Engle & Martin, 2010, p. 3) The reflective process is extremely important for the program participant to understand some of the gains of the international experience. These gains are sometimes hard for students to put into words as they are not tangible and cannot be measured by a test.

In *Beyond Reflection through an Academic Lens*, Pagano & Roselle (2009), echo the thoughts of Engle and Martin by stating that, “Reflection as a process means helping students to take a step back to look at an experience, to frame it, and to derive meaning from it. Ideally, the framing of the experience helps students sort out events from the practice and provides meaning and understanding for themselves about practical skills [gained]” (p. 219). Carefully crafted questions are imperative for students to successfully assess and evaluate their experience. Well framed questions are also critical for guiding students in the important task of reflection. They help students to understand all the gains, whether measurable or not, they have acquired from their education abroad experience.

In *The Handbook for the Effective Design and Implementation of Qualitative Assessment*, Engle and Martin suggest a new approach to the assessment of education abroad programming. It is proposed that program assessment is most efficient when the program is broken down into components. Breaking a program into components allows education abroad stakeholders the ability to simplify a program by placing different program aspects into predefined categories with predetermined goals and challenges. This makes identifying problem areas easier while facilitating a more holistic approach to program design, implementation, and assessment. Using a component approach to assessment allows the stakeholders that design and implement programs the wherewithal to truly understand a program by understanding each program piece. This
subsequently allows stakeholders to develop achievable program goals that can be measured with well-crafted student assessment questions.

Engle and Martin have developed just such a tool that allows for programming that includes desired goals, known challenges, and an appropriate student assessment. The Components Based Inventory (CBI) is a holistic tool that provides the basic framework for any individual to design, implement, and assess programming. The education abroad professional uses the basic structure provided by the CBI to create specific program goals, subsequent challenges, and appropriate assessment questions for students. One of the most important aspects of the CBI is that education abroad programs are not a one-size-fits-all. The program designer must understand that each program is different and has unique challenges and goals. The CBI will be discussed in greater detail in the evaluation section of this paper.

Assessment and evaluation are a growing and important trend in the field of education abroad. The literature is clear that an internal battle of sorts is currently ongoing in the field. The reliance on consumerism as the base for which program assessment and evaluation is performed is starting to run into turbulence, as more professionals in the field search for ways to measure student learning outcomes without sacrificing student satisfaction. The introduction of the market into education abroad has raised many important questions, it’s important to find the connection between the two and, more importantly, a balance. As David Wong states in his 2015 article, *Beyond It Was Great? Not So Fast*, “The field of study abroad has always been a mix of marketplace and scholarship, this is not likely to change. We will need to be aware of how the close connection to marketing products and services can be both healthy and debilitating for the scholarly growth of our field” (p. 133).
Many scholars have taken steps to improve student assessment by providing education abroad professionals appropriate methods for the construction of assessment and evaluation tools that help propel the field forward, while minimizing the impact of U.S. consumer society and the market influence on the field of international education. This is because, “the importance of guided self-reflection in the experiential learning process offers more than a dutiful administrative closure to a term abroad. Such questionnaires encourage students to recognize the challenges and rewards of an educational experience inherently different from that of the home campus and to take responsibility for their own level of engagement and subsequent achievements” (Engle & Martin, 2010, p. 3).

**Needs Assessment**

Study abroad within U.S. universities has seen a rapid expansion over the last ten years. The field has branched out from only offering semester or year abroad programs, to offering short-term summer, January, and May terms, along with service learning programs and international internships. The increase in the number of students who go abroad, combined with the overall trend within U.S. higher education for accountability, has provided a greater need to assess and evaluate the outcomes of the student experience (Deardorff, 2009, p. 346). The need to assess and evaluate the student experience is important for all institutions and organizations involved in education abroad. In context to the private provider, success is often gauged on student satisfaction, because of the dependence of positive word-of-mouth for future student recruitment.

In order to determine the need for a new program assessment and evaluation tool and process at CISabroad, interviews were scheduled and discussions were held with six different individuals with differing roles within CISabroad. In these discussions there was talk about the
current program at the University of Otago and past program assessment and evaluation initiatives by company. The individuals interviewed included Joe Debiec (Director of Programs), Brian Waldron (Programs Team Manager), Jeff Palm (Founder and CEO of CISabroad), Seth Weil (current Program Coordinator for New Zealand), Alex Hill (New Zealand Site Director), and Karen Carswell (Marketing Manager). In talking with these individuals, it became apparent that there was a need for a program assessment and evaluation process, and a need for a new student assessment tool.

The need for new assessment and evaluation tools and a new process of program assessment is clearly desired by all individuals at CISabroad. In discussions, the idea of program quality kept coming up. The company has just embarked on a quality initiative, which includes defining what program quality is and developing goals and objectives for programming and students. Since a lot of time and effort is currently being spent on defining quality, it is natural that the company would want to be able to assess the quality of their programs and work towards improving programming to reach agreed upon quality benchmarks.

The need for a new student assessment tool was very evident from all individuals at CISabroad who were interviewed. The old student assessment tool only allowed for generalized responses, and not the type of specific data needed to make effective changes and create program specific action plans. Questions that solicit general responses do not allow the company to pinpoint program deficiencies effectively. It was also apparent through discussions and a review of literature that too much control was being given to program participants to determine whether a program was of high quality. Students who often times have no other experiences from which to gauge what a quality program would look like in any given location. Jeff Palm was
responsible for the initial idea of changing the design of the student assessment tool using component based questions that help provide information that is specific and useful.

Student response rates to assessment questionnaire were also very poor. This created a need and a desire within the organization for a change in assessment methods to increase the student response rate. There was also a need for a change in the type of question that were being asked to students. New questions that provided more useful results, along with results that could be easily quantified. Finally, there was a need for a general process for overall program assessment. This did not exist in the past. Since there has been an initiative to keep programming staff in the company longer, and decrease staff turnover, CIS has been presented with an opportunity for the current staff to really take ownership over their programs and to begin to understand where things are working well, and where there is room for improvement. Using staff expertise, gained by longer staff tenure, action plans for improvement can now be developed, but only if there is a process in place to assess programming. See Appendix E for a list of general questions for interviewing the CISabroad staff mentioned prior.

Goals and Objectives

“First and foremost, underlying any program abroad should be some sort of study learning outcomes. What do we want our students to be able to do, acquire, and learn while they are abroad? Specific outcomes may vary on the type and structure of a program. Some outcomes may be extremely discipline-specific, while others may be quite general, something that would pertain to all students regardless of major or program of study” (Teague, 2014, p. 75-76). The importance of student learning goals and objectives should never be under represented in a program’s design, but for the private provider, it’s important to realize the limitations of a direct enroll program, where the provider has little control over academics. It is also important to set
realistic goals for the intended gain of intercultural competencies that can be for students in a relatively short period of time.

Goals and objectives for a program should match those outlined by the organization who is providing the program, in this case, CISabroad. At CISabroad, student learning and development goals are important, but being a provider, there are other aspects to programming that play an equally important role to program success. These aspects would rely heavily on the role student satisfaction has in program development for a third party provider. It is imperative, maybe for the survival of the company, to remember student satisfaction in programming and when setting program goals and objectives. Program goals and objectives are tightly linked to how CISabroad defines program quality, and will be reflected in the following bullet points, along with the goals and objectives specific to the Otago program and its participants.

**Program Goals & Objectives**

- Provide comfortable student accommodations that are in line with local quality standards
  - Discuss and set reasonable housing expectations in depth before departure and in on-site orientation for life in New Zealand
  - Provide safe and comfortable accommodations in line with local standards

- Facilitate cultural curriculum that is immersive, experiential, and relevant to education abroad location.
  - Student completes optional reading for structured cultural excursions
  - Students attend all cultural excursions and participate in structured discussions about cultural experience

- Support student experience from start to finish with staff that are knowledgeable, available, helpful, and responsive
  - Provide multiple ways for students to connect and engage with program staff
  - Program coordinator schedules a mid-term check-in call with all students
  - Clearly lay out role of responsibility of the Program Coordinator, the Site Director, and the Student in a pre-departure action plan, and again on-site

- Mitigate site specific risks for students in New Zealand.
  - Ban extreme activities such as bungee jumping, white water kayaking, and mountaineering
Add component to Online Pre-departure Orientation that highlights risks of weather and outdoor activities
Discuss outdoor safety at on-site orientation

- Program challenges students to grow personally, academically, and professionally
  - Direct enroll in foreign institution for a full term
  - Live in housing that is mixed with students from the US and from New Zealand
  - Offer cultural excursions with a chance for reflection and discussion afterwards

**Student Goals & Objectives**

- Increased student confidence and independence
  - Learn to comfortably navigate host city’s transportation system
  - Student understanding that while different and difficult, they were able to adapt to the host university’s style of instruction

- Increased understanding of local and native culture
  - Student attends all cultural activities and excursions
  - Student participates in group discussion of local and native culture while on program excursions

- Increased student responsibility for their own experience
  - By implementing reflective questions in student assessment that put some responsibility for the program’s success on the student
  - Student takes initiative to immerse in the local culture outside of CIS structured activities

**Program Description**

**Program Scope**

The Semester on the South Island is a four month direct enroll program open for any fulltime student currently enrolled at an accredited U.S. institution. Participants will take up to four papers (courses) and earn up to 16 U.S. credits during one semester at the University of Otago. Participants will attend two structured cultural activities, one day trip and one weekend long excursion, along with a four day on-site orientation and a farewell dinner. The primary student assessment will occur at the end of the program. A separate student assessment of the Programs Team’s (PT) role in advising students will come prior to the participant’s departure. The data gained from this student assessment will be used by the Programs Team at their assessment.
summit in August, where action plans for program improvement are built and/or updated. Please see the evaluation section of this proposal for more detailed information on Action Planning.

**Program Timeline**

The application deadline for the New Zealand program, Semester on the South Island, will be set on November 15\(^{th}\) of the year before, thus giving adequate time to the PT to prepare students for their upcoming experience. The actual program will begin on February 19\(^{th}\), and run through June 22\(^{nd}\) of the following year. It is important to note that the North American spring term, which is usually the second term in the academic year in the Northern Hemisphere, is the first term in the Southern Hemisphere. The U.S. fall term is the second term in the Southern Hemisphere. The participant arrival date will be on February 19\(^{th}\). From February 19\(^{th}\) through the 22\(^{nd}\), CIS will hold its New Zealand Orientation with on-site staff in Wellington.

Classes at the University of Otago begin on February 24\(^{th}\) culminating with exams which run from June 7\(^{th}\) through June 21\(^{st}\). There will be a ten day university break from April 14\(^{th}\) through April 24\(^{th}\). An overnight excursion will take place second weekend of March (11\(^{th}\) – 14\(^{th}\)). A second excursion will be provided on May 7\(^{th}\). Program participants will depart New Zealand on June 23\(^{rd}\). The farewell dinner for program participants will be held on June 19\(^{th}\), and the on-site program student assessment and evaluation will be given at this dinner in paper form. (See Appendix F for a visual program timeline)

**Potential Participants**

Potential participants for the Semester on the South Island program will be U.S. university students with a junior or senior level standing at their home institution and a strong GPA.

Students interested in the natural sciences or education should be especially interested in this program given the university’s strength in these areas. Students who have an interest in the outdoors would be a good fit for this program as well, provided Otago’s unique location on the
South Island of New Zealand and the schools access to world class outdoor recreation. Other qualities potential participants should have is the desire to go big for their education abroad experience and an interest in indigenous cultures. New Zealand offers the opportunity to get about as far from home as one can get, along with the ability to study the Maori culture.

**Curriculum**

The Semester on the South Island is a direct enroll program. This means that all credit bearing course work is developed, implemented, and managed by the overseas partner, the University of Otago. CISabroad has no control over academics. Students who participate in the Semester of the South Island program choose their courses and directly register with Otago.

All CISabroad programming does include a cultural curriculum component that is built into the program. This includes structured activities in which students may participate. The cost of the excursions has been built into the program, so there is no additional cost for the student to attend. This program is intended to provide cultural excursions that act as informal curriculum for the student. Due to the nature of the direct enroll program, CISabroad cannot require students to complete assignments although it can be strongly encouraged. This inability to have graded assigned work is detrimental to the intercultural goals set by the program. While the program cannot offer structured assignments that must be fulfilled by the participant, it can offer guided excursions that help the student process the experience, learn more about the culture they are living in, and provide support for student growth and development.

By choosing to study abroad at the University of Otago, students are embarking on a journey that will be a source of tremendous personal development. The cultural curriculum offered by CISabroad will be experiential in nature and considerable time will be allotted for student reflection through facilitated discussion. Experiential learning, along with structured
reflection, has been championed by educational theorists such as David Kolb and John Dewey. In Beyond Reflection through an Academic Lens, Pagano and Rose (2009) state that, “There are several models in experiential learning theories, but Kolb’s (1984) model is widely used because it states that students can learn from experience. Kolb agrees with Dewey’s (1963) statement affirning that in order for learning to take place and be considered educational, the experience has to be transformed into knowledge by means of action or reflection”, furthermore, “when applied to study abroad, Kolb’s model can facilitate and guide some of the learning that takes place during the international experience because his model considers both experience and reflection” (p. 219). The planned cultural excursions for the Semester on the South Island program will provide for experiential learning, and allow for reflective practice in the form of guided discussions.

Program participants for the South Island program will be in their junior or senior years of college. They will have been living in a campus environment for a few years and will be more independent than their younger freshmen and sophomore peers. Baxter Magolda and Patricia King would identify these students as either being at the “crossroads” between “external formulas” and “self-authorship”, or well into the “self-authorship” phase of their development.

External formulas are those ideas presented to young individuals from figures of authority. External formulas are taken as truth by those who have not started the journey to “self-authorship”. The individual then enters the “crossroads”, where they begin to listen to their own inner voice and question those external formulas they have depended on for so long. The final stage is “self-authorship” where the individual now relies on their own judgement and authority to make decisions. (Baxter Magolda, M. & King, P. 2004, p. 211)
Many students participating in the Semester on the South Island program will be on this road towards “self-authorship”. They will be independent, maybe for the first time, in a place very far from home and without the support and structure to which they are accustomed. For this reason, it is important to provide structure and support where necessary through the programs on-site staff. The Site Director (SD) is available for student who need that extra support. The SD is also there to structure activities that will provide plenty of room for students to reflect and process the experience. In open but guided discussions, students will be able to talk about their experience in New Zealand. Guided discussions can also focus on the cultural aspect of the program. The purpose of the reflective portion of the curriculum will be to help “students to take a step back to look at an experience, to frame it and to derive meaning from it.” (Pagano & Rose, 2009, p. 219)

**Excursions**

On-site Orientation - Three days in Wellington, NZ (February 19\textsuperscript{th} – February 22\textsuperscript{nd})

- Museum of New Zealand
- Walking tour of Wellington
- Maori Haka Ceremony
- Overview of program, excursions, health and safety, budgeting money, culture, housing, code of conduct, SD and student roles. (See student code of conduct in Appendix H)

The cultural curriculum for students participating in the Semester on the South Island program will involve a three night/four day on-site orientation in Wellington, New Zealand. Students participating in the Semester on the North Island program will be included in this orientation. A welcome dinner, activity fees, necessary transportation fees, and lodging will be provided as part of the program fees cost. Suggested readings for the programs’ cultural excursions will be provided before departure. These readings will provide background for many
of the programs excursions and will be used in facilitated reflective discussions throughout the term. Students will take part in a ceremonial Maori Haka in Wellington and visit the Museum of New Zealand. While the readings cannot be required, they will be strongly encouraged as the Site Director will reference them during reflective discussions about the Maori and their role in New Zealand culture.

- Overnight Excursion in Christchurch NZ (March 11th – March 14th)
  - New Zealand Pavlova cooking lesson.
  - Walking tour of Christchurch
  - Canterbury Museum
  - Lyttleton Harbor Day (Christchurch and NZ role for Antarctic explorers)

The four day trip to Christchurch will include many activities and provide homestays for students with New Zealand families. Students will learn to cook a traditional New Zealand dish, Pavlova with the Site Directors family. There will be a walking tour of the city, which is provided free by the city government. A visit to the Canterbury Museum will allow students to learn about the history of Christchurch and the devastating earthquake which occurred there in 2011. It will also give the students background about Christchurch’s role in the exploration of Antarctica. The city was, and still is, the jumping off point for most of the world’s expeditions to the frozen continent. Students will learn about the role the area played in early Antarctic expeditions at the Canterbury Museum, and will then see firsthand the places those early explorers equipped and trained their teams in Lyttleton Harbor on Quail Island. The day trip to Lyttleton Harbor will go to the actual sites Amundsen, Shackleton, and Scott stayed before racing each other to be the first humans to reach the South Pole. There will be time for prompted
group discussion about the important role New Zealand has played in the world, past and present. Suggested readings will be provided.

- Day trip (May 7th)
  
  o Otago Peninsula Tour
    
    ▪ Albatross and Penguin Colonies (Unique Taiaroa Tour)
    
    ▪ Larnach Castle

  A day trip will be organized for students on the South Island program and will highlight the nearby Otago Peninsula, an important nesting area for the Blue Penguin and the Royal Albatross. Students will visit and learn the history of New Zealand’s only castle, Larnach Castle. Led by the Site Director, the unique geography and wildlife of the peninsula will be discussed and then experienced by students. A 1.5 hour guided tour will highlight the albatross and penguin colonies, along with the culture of the people who inhabit the Otago Peninsula. Suggested readings will be provided prior to the excursion.

- Farewell Dinner (June 19th)
  
  o Facilitated discussion about the experience, the challenges, and the rewards.

  At the farewell dinner, the Site Director will lead a group discussion on the overall experience students had on their Semester on the South Island program. Students will be able to reflect on their time in New Zealand and talk about what they learned about the culture, the challenges of living and studying abroad, what they are going to take away from the experience. Following this reflective discussion, students will be asked to fill out a paper assessment about their experience, which will act as another tool for student reflection. (Please see Appendix I for timeline of events and further excursion specific information and details)
Staffing
The staffing plan for the Semester on the South Island program breaks down into on-site staff and Northampton staff. All staff are already in place and there is no need to hire new personnel.

CISabroad Northampton Staff
- General Northampton Departments and Staff
  - Finance Department
  - Human Resources
  - Marketing Department
  - Information Technology Department

CISabroad Program Specific Staffing
- University Relation Representatives
  - University Relation Representatives (UR Reps) are critical in program marketing and promotion. CISabroad has a team of individuals spread out across the country who oversee a territory of states in which they recruit and promote CISabroad programming. These individuals attend study abroad fairs, give program talks and presentations at universities, and form relationships with U.S. institution education abroad offices. They are the “road warriors” for CISabroad.
- Program Advisor
  - The program advisor is the first point of contact for all students interested in the Semester on the South Island program. This individual is responsible for the initial screening of potential program participants and works with students as they decide which program is a good fit. Dealing with participant “leads”, the program advisor handles all Semester on the South Island inquiries and spends a great deal of time reaching out to potential participants to gauge interest and make sure students meet program requirements.
- Program Coordinator
The Program Coordinator (PC) is the main point of contact for all applicants who have paid the $200 deposit for the Semester on the South Island program. This individual will be the primary student advisor and work with participants who are preparing to depart for their term abroad. The PC will also assist, when necessary, with on-site issues, along with the Site Director. The Program Coordinators helps student navigate the process of enrollment at the University of Otago, advises on logistics including housing, visa requirements, course selection, travel, and re-entry processes. The PC also reviews academic recommendations and works with the home institution’s study abroad office.

- Program Team Assistant
  - The Program Team Assistant (PTA) will be the fall back point contact to the program coordinator for students applying to the Semester on the South Island program. This individual will help to process applications, create and update online orientations, and keep students on track for acceptance into the program, along with answer basic advising questions students have.

- Data Specialist
  - The data analyst is responsible for digitizing all feedback from paper student evaluations and compiling in that data in Microsoft Excel. This individual quantifies all qualitative student feedback and display data in graphical form for analysis by the Programs Team and management. This individual has advanced knowledge of statistical representation and of the software necessary to display data in an easily digestible form.

CISabroad On-Site Staff
- Site Director
o The Site Director is the point of contact for all students who are currently enrolled in the program and are on-site. They are the person who will be the first CISabroad responder to all emergency, health, and safety issues that arise with program participants. The Site Director deals directly with the on-site participants and the overseas partner to tackle student complaints. This individual also helps to develop and implement on-site cultural activities. Finally, the Site Director is responsible for the implementing the program assessment survey to students at the farewell dinner and returning the completed surveys to the Northampton office.

Admission Criteria
- 3.0 GPA
- Junior or Senior level status at home university
  *Sophomores with exceptional credentials will be considered on a case by case basis
- Study Abroad Advisor Approval
- Academic Reference from home institution

Disability Disclaimer
There will be no discrimination against ANY student for any reason. Students with any type disability will be accommodated as best they can by CISabroad staff both in the United States and in New Zealand. The University of Otago is very accommodating to students with physical disabilities. The campus is wheelchair accessible and participants in need of wheelchair accessible housing can be accommodated. Students who are accompanied by a service animal, such as a seeing-eye dog, can also be accommodated. Students with any type of physical disabilities are encouraged by CISabroad to apply to the Semester on the South Island program. Specific scholarship information provided by our affiliate Diversity Abroad, along with Mobility International will also be provided to all applicable applicants. (See more on the University of Otago’s disability support in Appendix G)
Diversity Plan
Diversity in participants is very important to CISabroad and the company provides resources for students traveling abroad who are from diverse backgrounds. The company prides itself on being the lowest cost provider in the field. The importance of being low-cost is that it increases access for those who may not otherwise have the financial ability to study abroad. Many CISabroad students are first generation, and come from a large variety of backgrounds. Recently, CIS joined the Generation Study Abroad initiative developed by the Institute of International Education (IIE) and has pledged to increase access to education abroad to LGBTQ+ students. The company is doing so by providing LGBTQ+ specific programming and increasing the number of resources for students who identify as LGBTQ+ and that want to study abroad. These company-wide initiatives also apply to the Semester on the South Island program. The goal for the South Island program is be inclusive to all individuals wishing to participate. This goal is being actively worked towards by promoting financial assistance for students, by encouraging and supporting students from diverse backgrounds to apply and participate in the program, and by having the proper resources available for all potential students.

Marketing and Recruitment
Marketing and recruiting for the Semester on the South Island program at the University of Otago will be handled by the CISabroad marketing and university relation teams. The university relations team will work with existing partner institutions in the U.S. to recruit students. They will also reach out to new institutions with which the company does not currently have affiliations. The marketing team works to get the CISabroad name and brand out into the world of higher education through social media and by ensuring the company has a presence on online education abroad sites, such as GoAbroad and Rate My Study Abroad. These can be important tools for recruiting students for CISabroad programming. As most students are likely
to search online for programming options in their countries of interest, CISabroad must ensure that it has a notable presence on these types of websites.

**Competitors at the University of Otago**

Competitor analysis shows that there are four other providers who partner with the University of Otago. They offered semester programming in 2016 at prices ranging between $17,650 and $20,850, depending upon provider. The least expensive option to attend a semester long program at the University of Otago for the 2016 spring semester was Academic Programs International (API) at $17,650. The most expensive direct enroll Otago program was offered by the Institute for Study Abroad-Butler (IFSA-Butler) at $20,850. International Studies Abroad (ISA) was priced at $18,100 and Arcadia was priced at $18,850, both falling in between the two price extremes. CISabroad is well positioned to continue providing competitive programming for students who wish to study abroad at the University of Otago. The CISabroad price for spring 2017 is $18,190, which is an increase over last year, but with the increase comes a lot more value in terms of offered cultural excursions. It should be noted all program prices for these four competitors was from spring 2016. The prices for all programs may increase for 2017.

**Logistics**

**Communications**

Student communication with staff in Northampton prior to departure will either be via phone or email. This will be same for student communication with on-site staff in New Zealand, although social media outlets such as Facebook may also be used for informal discussions and for arranging activities. A Facebook group does exist for students to connect to one another before departure, and once in country, if they should choose to join. This platform is useful for students when arranging extracurricular activities not provided by CISabroad. There will also be
a 24/7 number provided to students to use in case of emergency. There is more information on this number and its purpose provided in the Health and Safety section of this proposal.

Visa
All program participants will be required to obtain their own student visa for study in New Zealand. CISabroad will help guide the student and answer any questions they may have, but will not obtain the visa for the student. The New Zealand study visa (INZ 1012) is not too difficult to obtain but students will need to plan for its acquisition and make sure they start the process with plenty of time to spare. The Program Coordinator will send instructions to students upon their acceptance and a confirmation of enrollment once it is received from the University of Otago.

The Program Coordinator will also be responsible for sending the student an official letter for Customs which will outline the CISabroad financial arrangements and the international insurance letter. This letter will be sent to the student once the confirmation of enrollment has arrived from Otago. Students must also remember that they are not allowed to work in New Zealand on a study visa. Non-U.S. citizens currently studying at U.S. institutions, who are enrolling in a CIS program, will need responsible for acquiring their own visa. CIS does not provide visa assistance, other than directing the student to the appropriate resources, to students who hold a non-U.S. passport.

Pre-Departure Orientation
A pre-departure orientation will be held for students with both the Program Coordinator and the New Zealand Site Director. This will be virtual as students and staff are located in many different places, and in many different time zones. The pre-departure orientation will be held within a month of the program start date (typically 2 weeks out) and will provide site specific information about the university, the city, CISabroad insurance, travel logistics,
accommodations, and cultural curriculum excursions. The pre-departure orientation is where students will be first introduced to their Site Director and provide a forum for discussion about the upcoming program. Recommended cultural curriculum readings will be provided.

Room and Board
The majority of program participants will stay in rented accommodations, which in New Zealand are called, flats. These flats are shared apartments. Flats are plentiful in Dunedin and within walking distance to both the university and to the city center. Living in the flats are an important part of student life at the University of Otago. They are shared with other international students, but also New Zealand students. They offer freedom and responsibility to the student and allow for a chance to live with “Kiwi” students. Each flat will normally have at least one New Zealand host student. They are fully furnished and are contracted to students for 24 weeks. Some flats have been modified for students with disabilities.

An important note about housing in Dunedin is that the flats offer little insulation, which can come as a surprise to U.S. students. Space heaters are often used to warm rooms. Space heaters will be provided by the owners of the housing. Students participating in the Semester on the South Island program should be prepared for cooler temperatures in their housing. Since many students are on a budget, heaters are used as little as possible, so appropriate clothing is essential. It is good to set student expectations about the climate early and often. Reminding students to bring warm clothing can help make adjusting to life in a flat easier, while keeping electrical bills to a minimum. A washing machine and dryer will be provided in each flat. Students will also be responsible for bringing their own towels, or they may purchase them once in country.

Some flats may have a dishwasher, but others will not. Each flat will have a kitchen with a stove/oven, microwave, refrigerator, glassware, silverware, pots/pans, etc. It is a basic set up,
but sufficient for most flats. Students will be responsible for buying and cooking their own food. No meal plan is included. For this reason, among others, it is important to advise students to have a flat meeting after everyone has arrived create a list of chores that need to be completed each day, and each week.

**Transportation**

Program participants will be responsible for booking their own transportation to and from New Zealand, although guidelines and suggestions will be provided beforehand. Transportation from the airport in New Zealand to the on-site orientation site will be arranged by CISabroad, in coordination with the on-site staff. Once students have arrived at the University of Otago, they are required to check in with the international office before the University of Otago international student orientation.

All cultural curriculum transportation will be provided by CISabroad. Bus tickets and cab fare will be part of the program fees and will be arranged by the on-site staff. Any personal travel will be at the participant’s expense. CISabroad staff may offer suggestions for personal travel, but will not advise further on specific independent student travel. For example, a Site Director or Program coordinator may suggest travel destinations and the best means of transportation to get there, but will not do research into pricing and times of buses or flights. Personal travel is the participant’s responsibility.

**Health and Safety**

Ensuring the health and safety of participants is one of the most important responsibilities for CISabroad. Any time a student abroad travels abroad, there is a responsibility for making sure they are as prepared and safe as can possibly be expected. It is crucial for a third party provider to maintain a good safety record and to deal with any issues that may arise as quickly and responsibly as possible. Word of mouth is everything for a third party provider. If that word
is that a provider does not provide students with a structure of safety, universities will cease to partner with that provider.

A direct enroll program relies heavily on the foreign institution for student support, as that is where the student will be spending most of their time. That being said, the CISabroad on-site staff are always there to provide additional support and to be an additional resource for students, should they need it. CISabroad goes to great length to mitigate risk and make participants aware of the dangers they may experience while abroad. By being proactive and having a well-structured crisis response system in place, CISabroad is well positioned to ensure that all participants remain safe while abroad. Health and safety is built into the company’s pre-departure orientation, and is brought up again at the on-site orientation with the Site Director. It is also tediously outlined on the website for all students and their parents. (See Appendix J)

New Zealand is a relatively safe country with low crime rates. The real dangers students may expect to encounter will come from extracurricular activities, especially unsanctioned activities. The country is one of the adventure capitals of the world with big mountains and many high risk recreational activities. Students can easily access the mountains where there is world class hiking, climbing, and skiing. These can all be high risk activities, especially when they are undertaken without the proper expertise and guidance. For this reason, activities like climbing, bungee-jumping, sky diving, and white water kayaking are not permitted by CISabroad. Students wishing to spend time in the outdoors hiking or biking are strongly encouraged to go with an experienced guide. Students are required to read and sign the CISabroad handbook which includes the code of student conduct. Any student who chooses to break the explicit rules set by CISabroad for program participants may be terminated from the program at any time.
Insurance
All CISabroad students are given a comprehensive insurance package before traveling abroad. The Cultural Insurance Services International (CISI) insurance covers all accident and medical related expenses. (See Appendix K for insurance details)

Crisis Management
CISabroad defines an emergency/crisis as “An emergency is when the student is in a life-threatening situation or in a situation that may cause serious psychological or emotional trauma. If the problem can wait 24 hours, it is most likely not an emergency.” (CISabroad, 2016a) Any crisis is managed on a case-by-case basis and is defined as either a Major Crisis or an Individual Crisis. (See Appendix L for breakdown and examples of crises)

In the event of a crisis abroad, students should call the emergency number given to them prior to departure and again at the on-site orientation. This number is also available on the website. This number reaches a phone that is held by an individual of the Crisis Response Team, who is a trained individual of the CISabroad Northampton staff. The number is operational at all times, 24/7/365. When called, the person answering has a network of on-site contacts to which they can connect. After assessing the situation, and stabilizing the situation as best possible, all senior members of CISabroad are brought up to speed as to the extent of the situation. From that point and going forward all parties’ makes decisions as to the best possible course of action.

There is also coordination with the home university to ensure “that the response is in line with university policies and practices. If needed, a home institution staff member may become part of the response team” (CISabroad, 2016b). In the event that a country becomes unsafe for a program to proceed, then the CISabroad cancellation policy will go into effect. (See Appendix M for policy)
Evaluation
Philosophical Approach

Balancing the need in assessment for customer service based questions and student learning based questions is the key theme for the South Island student assessment tool. The need for balance puts the private provider into a unique position, being both a for-profit business and an organization focused on student learning and development. Finding an equilibrium in student assessment is critical for CISabroad. The company must take into account student satisfaction in order to ensure students choose CISabroad as their provider. On the other hand, CISabroad states its mission is “to provide innovative education programs that broaden academic perspectives, promote global awareness, and encourage personal development while laying the foundation for participants to become engaged world citizens.” (CISabroad, 2016c)

While developing this student assessment tool, it was important that the questions put more responsibility on the student for their own international experience. CISabroad can offer support and guidance, but ultimately the student is responsible for the success of their term abroad at Otago. The student assessment tool can help students realize that they were partially in control of their own experience. It is possible to create questions which implicitly or explicitly imply student responsibility in the experience. Implicating students as part owners of the experience can help limit unwarranted negative feedback by creating awareness that sole responsibility for a successful experience wasn’t only the provider’s job, but also the students.

Another major theme woven into the student assessment tool was the idea of removing the role of quality assessment agent from the student. When asking questions that directly solicit advice from students to improve a program, there is a great amount of control placed into the student’s hands. Students are treated as experts, who are qualified to measure the quality of international programming, even though the only international experience the student may have
had was this program. What past experiences is the student using to determine program quality? Are they experts in the field of international education, or have they only spent one term abroad at the University of Otago? Questions that have removed the opportunity to be quality control agents will allow for the assessment to achieve what it sets out to do, which is to collect substantive feedback. This can be accomplished by simply asking the right questions; questions that have been framed correctly in proper context.

The student assessment tool for this program was built as a platform to help student’s reflect on their experience. There is merit in asking questions that provide critical program feedback which is useful for program improvement, but also as avenue for students to process their experience. Using a reflective platform, with appropriately worded questions linked to desired goals can go a long way in program assessment, and provide beneficial results for both the provider and the program participant.

In the literature review, the theory of assessment and evaluation was discussed in great depth and it is now possible to connect that theory to practice by laying out the assessment and evaluation tools that were built for the Semester on the South Island program. All the assessment tools for this program follow a component based approach. The component based assessment is heavily influenced by ideas presented in the Handbook for Qualitative Student Assessment by Patricia Martin and Lilli Engle. A Component Based Inventory (CBI) makes it possible to produce a thematic breakdown of program elements and to ask questions that more effectively deliver the type of information needed to facilitate appropriate program change. The CBI allows an organization to effectively assess whether goals and objectives are being met for each program component, and whether programming is following the generally stated mission of the organization. (Engle and Martin, 2010, p.9)
The South Island student assessment tool was structured around components that link to the program/student goals and objectives developed earlier. The predetermined program components allows CISabroad to measure the level of program success in relation to the goals set for each component, as opposed to rather vague program-wide goals. The general goals of the program are to provide students with a safe living and learning environment, supportive and knowledgeable staff, and the tools necessary to develop greater independence and understanding of both their own culture and the culture in which they are immersed. The general student goals and objectives of the South Island program are to increase independence, cultural awareness, and student responsibility in program success. The over-arching program/student goals and objectives are then broken down further through use of the Component Based Inventory.

The goals and objectives for the South Island program are revisited and further refined in the assessment. Each goal and objective is specifically placed into its appropriate component. Once the goal is properly placed, known challenges for goal achievement can be assigned. By knowing what challenges a student may face to achieve stated program/student goals, it is possible to implement proper program design and staff support for the intended output of student success. Under the student assessment tool section of this paper, components have been assigned tailored goals and challenges.

**Qualitative Student Assessment Design Principals**

The student assessment tool will use a Likert scale for most questions. A sliding Likert scale format for questions asks the subject to choose amongst given numbers which have predetermined values. For example, on a 1-5 scale, the number 1 may represent “never” and the number 5 may represent “always”, with 2-4 falling somewhere subjectively in between. (Boari & Nai Ruscone, 2015, p. 288) A Likert scale format was predominantly used in this student assessment, however, instead of a 1-5 range being given with students choosing a number to
represent their answer, the response options are qualitative. The data will be on the ordinal level. Ordinal level data assumes you can rank the responses from highest to lowest. (Jaeger, 1993, p. 39-40) A 1 is worse than a 2, which is worse than a 3, and so on. The reason for not using a strictly quantitative based 1-5 scale for questions is based upon the idea that numerical responses are based in consumeristic ideology. (Engle and Martin, 2010, p. 57) Numerical values are also far more subjective with one individual’s 4 being vastly different from another individuals.

For the purposes of the Semester on the South Island student assessment tool, questions will ask students to answer questions given four predetermined responses; a 1-4 scale. The sliding Likert scale will provide data on an ordinal level and generally use four response choices. Students will only have four options from which to choose. Adding a fifth response, a neutral response, can allow students to take the middle road, which will not provide useful feedback for the company. (Engle & Martin, 2010, p. 57) The student assessment tool also provides questions that are open-ended and ask students to write their thoughts. These responses can be a sentence or a paragraph in length. In the final component of the assessment, students are asked to indicate which generalized skills and development goals they feel they have gained from the program. A predetermined list of skills is provided by CISabroad and students are able to check-off which skill they feel they improved on or gained from their experience abroad. (See Appendix N for the student assessment tool)

**Program Assessment Process and Tools**

The overall assessment process for the Semester on the South Island program will involve student feedback from the student assessment, program coordinator feedback, and on-site staff feedback. Using three perspectives, the assessment process will gain valuable insight from both students and staff who are the major stakeholders in the program’s success. Program assessment will be given to students at two different periods. The first assessment will happen
just prior to departure, after the online pre-departure orientation, and will focus on the experience of working with U.S. program staff. The second assessment will occur at the end of the program and will measure the success of the on-site portion of the program. Student assessment will be summative in nature and not formative. The resources needed for a formative assessment are not currently available at CISabroad.

On-site staff and U.S. staff program assessment will occur once a year in the beginning of summer. A separate survey is sent to both the Program Coordinator and the Site Director. These surveys are not qualitative. They ask staff to rate programming on a quantitative 1-10 sliding Likert scale. The staff are experienced individuals who can act as quality control agents, and have the ability to assess program quality without as much context built into questions. This is not to say there is not context present, just less of it as compared to the student assessment.

CISabroad staff should be able to objectively answer questions about their programs. Component based practices are again employed for the staff program assessment. All assessment results are compiled and presented to the U.S. program staff at the Programs Team assessment meeting. It is at this time action plans are created, evaluated, and updated. (See Program Assessment and Evaluation Timeline Process in Appendix P)

**Student Assessment Tool**

The student assessment tool for the Semester on the South Island program breaks down into seven different components including: Program Coordination, CISabroad Orientations, On-site Staff, Living Situation, Cultural Immersion, Academics, and Overall Program. Each of these components has a goal associated with it, which is aligned to the mission of the program/organization, along with the program/student goals and objectives outlined earlier in this project. Provided with the stated goal(s) for each component are the challenges associated with the goal.
In order to measure student intercultural and development gains it is necessary to have a starting point for students. CISabroad has decided to use a starting point of zero for all students. While some students may have previous intercultural experience, it is believed that most will not. While it would be possible to determine a starting point for each student, the process would be very time and resource intensive. The time and money necessary to perform an adequate assessment of individual student starting points for intercultural development is just not possible for the company at the present moment. For this reason, it was reasonably assumed by those individuals able to make such assumptions, that a starting point of zero would be used for the assessment of student development.

In regards to consumer based questions, students are assumed to be on the level of an average American. This means, students go into the experience preconditioned to U.S. consumer culture. It is important to remember that the Semester on the South Island program is a mix of consumer-based and student-learning based questions that are qualitative in nature, but are easily quantifiable for the purpose of program quality analysis. Please see Appendix N for the full Semester on the South Island student assessment tool.

The program components with goals and challenges for the student assessment tool are listed below with a brief description and an example question from the student assessment tool.

**Program Components for Student Assessment: Goals and Challenges**

- Program Coordination
  - Goal: Ensure staff are helpful, available, responsive, and knowledgeable
  - Challenge: Student staff support expectations are sometimes unrealistically high
  - Question Example: My Program Coordination Team was responsive.
    
    Strongly agree; Agree; Disagree; Strongly disagree
The consumer culture in the United States often times sets unrealistically high standards for CISabroad staff. Students expect immediate responses to all questions and at times need a lot of “hand-holding” through the application and enrollment process. This is a huge challenge for CISabroad since PCs can be working with 100-200 students for any given term. That being said, it is still important that staff are attentive, responsive, knowledgeable, and helpful. Setting realistic expectations for communication is important from the start. This is a component with a strong link to customer satisfaction and it’s important to be cognizant of that in the assessment.

- **New Zealand Orientations (Pre-departure and On-Site)**
  - **Goal:** Student is adequately prepared to handle transition to life abroad.
  - **Challenge:** Students enter orientation with different levels of need and expectation.
  - **Question Example:** Understanding that there will always be unanticipated challenges while living abroad, the CISabroad online pre-departure orientation prepared me for the program. Strongly agree; Agree; Disagree; Strongly disagree

Students enrolled in the Semester on the South Island program come from different backgrounds and have different expectations for the type of information they will receive in orientation, both pre-departure and on-site. Some students may feel that every last detail, no matter how minute, should be covered in an orientation, while others will be less concerned. If a situation arises while abroad that was not discussed in orientation, students can sometimes feel the orientation was ineffective. In reality, there will always be unintended situations one must contend with while living and traveling abroad.

- **Living Situation**
Goal: Provide housing that is safe, of high quality and comfortable in terms of local standards, allows for intercultural communication,

Challenge: Housing is very different from what student is used to at home and may not have all the amenities in which they are accustomed

Question Example: My living environment was considerably different from what I am used to at home. Strongly agree; Agree; Disagree; Strongly disagree

The challenge for an international program is always finding housing that is safe and convenient for students. The idea of comfort in housing is different however. Housing that might be comfortable given local standards, may be a far cry from what the student is used to at the home university. Setting expectations early is very important, especially for the South Island program, where comfortable housing may not mean central heating. The typical room temperature that may be cooler than what a U.S. student is used to and finds to be acceptable.

- **On-Site Staff**
  
  Goal: Ensure staff that are helpful, available, responsive, and knowledgeable
  
  Challenge: Student expectations for staff support are sometimes unrealistically high
  
  Question Example: My CISabroad on-site staff were knowledgeable. Strongly agree; Agree; Disagree; Strongly disagree

  This component is very similar to the first component only in context to on-site staff. One point of contrast is the need for the SD to be more knowledgeable about local life than the U.S. based staff. The challenge of this component is the same as for U.S. based program staff component in that students have very high expectations for staff support.

- **Cultural Immersion**
○ Goal: Offer platform for connection with local people that provides insight and understanding into local culture and life,

○ Challenge: Difficult to provide affordable immersive excursions without having a superior level of local knowledge and personal connections

○ Question Example: To what degree were you able to take initiative outside program structured activities/excursions to meet and meaningfully interact with host nationals? Easily; Somewhat easily; With difficulty; I was never able to

Cultural immersion is something the student must do for the South Island program. The student is directly enrolled at the university and lives with other Kiwi students. While the program is immersive by nature, given it is direct enroll, providing immersive excursions can be complicated due to budgeting and time constraints. Having a SD that is well connected to the host country and has a very high level of local knowledge can help mitigate costs and increase immersion opportunities for students.

• Academics

○ Goal: Student understands connection between academic content and location of study and acknowledges challenge in adapting to local teaching styles

○ Challenge: CISabroad has little control over direct enroll program academics

○ Question Example: How easily were you able to adapt to the new academic style of your host nation and university? Easily; With difficulty but I adapted; I never got used to it; I rejected it

The academic component to programming for the South Island program is a challenge for CISabroad who offers a direct enroll program. CISabroad has no say over the academic portion of the program. It is important for students to connect their course work to the local culture when
possible. It is possible, however, for program staff to advise students on courses that will link study with location.

- **Overall Program**
  
  o Goal: Student acceptance of new routines and ways of behaving
  
  o Goal: Increased self-confidence, independence, interpersonal skills, curiosity, understanding of home culture, ability to think critically
  
  o Goal: Challenge student so they’re engaged but don’t “drop out” of experience
  
  o Challenge: Creating benchmarks for student growth that are reasonable and can be reached in the relatively short time
  
  o Challenge: Students who may be at different levels of maturity and have different levels of tolerance to ambiguity
  
  o Question Example: I was able to adapt to my new culture and its challenges, and although my experience was different and maybe at times uncomfortable, I was able to grow because of it. Strongly agree; Agree; Disagree; Strongly disagree

The overall component seeks to assess the goals of the program as a whole. This component is heavily focused on the student learning and development goals. The goal of the program is keep students engaged in the experience; for them to grow and develop personally, academically, and in the intercultural context. The objective is for students to be comfortable and supported during their experience while still being realistic in expectations for that support and comfort. Students need to be accountable for their own experience in places where accountability is warranted. The challenge for these goals lies in creating benchmarks that are realistic for the student to achieve. When establishing these benchmarks, it is also a challenge to incorporate different levels of student maturity and tolerance for ambiguity, as they will differ.
**Student Assessment Process**

The student assessment will take place at the farewell dinner and be implemented by the Site Director (SD). The assessment will be in paper format. A paper evaluation was chosen to be given on-site due to the low response rates of the online assessment tool. An on-site paper assessment will provide a 100 percent response and give the company the feedback necessary for program improvement. The SD will hand out the student program assessments and then nominate an individual to pick up all paper assessments and seal them in an envelope. The SD will then send the student assessments back to Northampton where they will be digitized and compiled by the in-house data specialist.

**Program Coordinator Program Assessment Process**

The Program Coordinator (PC) assessment tool used similar components to the student assessment but asks more in depth questions on program specifics. The components include: academics, on-site staff support, health and safety, cultural curriculum, housing, and over-seas partner support. All questions are a 1-10 quantitative answer scale, with the most negative being a one and the most positive being a ten. A zero mark would indicate the question is not applicable to the program. The questions are very specific and the answers from the PC program assessment will be used to measure the program against others offered by CISabroad. The PC assessment tool was designed to be a one size fits all across programming at the request of management and it is mentioned here because it is part of the overall assessment process.

**On-site Staff Program Assessment Process**

The on-site staff program assessment is similar to the Program Coordinator assessment tool. It asks very specific program questions that are best answered by the on-site programming staff. The tool follows the same format as the PC assessment, with a 1-10 scale for all questions. The components include health and safety, program and student experience, and cultural excursions. The New Zealand on-site staff assessment tool is sent to the Site Director and the
information gathered in compiled and the results are used to measure the program against others that CIS offers.

**Action Planning and the Assessment Cycle**

Assessment and evaluation are a cycle that creates a feedback loop. The current process is set on a yearly cycle, with the hope of making it a six month cycle. Student assessment for the South Island program happens after each term. The PC and SD assessment takes place in early summer, currently culminating in a two day action planning meeting in August where the program action plan is evaluated and modified from the results of all three assessments. A short informal meeting takes place in December for the PC to check-in about progress made to implement changes outlined in the action plan.

**Budget**

The budget for the Semester on the South Island of New Zealand program includes participant costs for university tuition, CISabroad cultural excursions, and accommodations. It also incorporates the staffing and overhead costs of the company and the staff who work with the program participants. There are additional expenses listed in the budget that CISabroad does not charge the student directly, but will be necessary for participation in the program. This might include airfare to New Zealand, course books, daily meals, etc. The final component that makes up the budget is the profit margin. CIS is a for-profit company so the margins are extremely important. This profit margin changes from program to program in company. The margin for this program might be low, but New Zealand is an expensive destination, and implementing a quality program there is not cheap. The budget is available to view, along with corresponding budget notes, in Appendix O of this program proposal.
Conclusion/Implications

The Semester on the South Island program is designed to provide university students a unique international experience in an amazing part of the world. Program participants will study at an institution known for its quality in academics, while immersing into local culture. The program provides an in depth look at culture and its connection to broader world. There have been attainable goals and objectives for both the student and the program set, with appropriate assessment tools in place to measure desired outcomes.

The student assessment tool, along with program assessment tools designed for the program staff, will be implemented to gauge the level of success for each goal and objective that have been stated. This approach to assessment is different in that it looks to replace the idea of using one-size-fits-all assessment tools with specific assessment tools built for the South Island program and the unique opportunities and challenges it presents.

Using the Component Based Inventory developed by Lilli Engle and Patricia Martin the South Island has been broken into components. Broad program goals and objectives find their respective homes in the student assessment tool, where the goal of each component is analyzed further and anticipated challenges are developed. The component challenges are used to help refine program design and development. If challenges are being successfully met by appropriate program design and implementation, the results of the student assessments will show them. The same can be said for other program assessment tools.

Looking towards the future, the individualized assessment process that was developed for the Semester on the South Island Program will be the model for all CISabroad programming. The idea is to replace the generalized student assessment currently being used for all programs with student assessments tools that take a deeper look at the opportunities and challenges associated
with each program location. This approach will allow CISabroad to better meet the needs of students, while ensuring the company’s mission is being fulfilled by the programming it offers.
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**Appendices**

**Appendix A: Map of New Zealand**

![New Zealand Map](http://planetolog.com/maps/map-country/big/dk/new-zealand.gif)

**Appendix B: Otago International Student Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS BY HOME COUNTRY</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALAYSIA</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED KINGDOM</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIA</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAUDI ARABIA</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANADA</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUNEI</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPAN</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAN</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINGAPORE</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCE</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>% change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>36,210</td>
<td>38,250</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>29,848</td>
<td>31,166</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>26,281</td>
<td>26,949</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>17,210</td>
<td>17,597</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>14,413</td>
<td>13,763</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>9,544</td>
<td>10,377</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>8,084</td>
<td>8,823</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>8,497</td>
<td>8,578</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>8,320</td>
<td>8,369</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>5,758</td>
<td>5,978</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>5,331/</td>
<td>4,869/</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-6.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>4,377</td>
<td>4,583</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>3,730</td>
<td>4,445</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>4,549</td>
<td>4,301</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>4,223</td>
<td>4,229</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>3,438</td>
<td>3,699</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>3,552</td>
<td>3,572</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>3,302</td>
<td>3,545</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td>3,395</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>2,879</td>
<td>3,333</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>3,042</td>
<td>3,219</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>2,304</td>
<td>3,068</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>2,793</td>
<td>3,021</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>2,798</td>
<td>2,875</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>2,673</td>
<td>2,744</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**World Total**: 289,408, 304,467, 100.0, 5.2

Appendix D: The Cycle of Assessment and Evaluation

Source: Lille Engle, *The Rewards of Qualitative Assessment Appropriate to Study Abroad*, 2013, p. 119

Appendix E: Needs Assessment Interview Questions

**Student Assessment Interview Questions:**

What type of information is most important for you to gather from a student assessment? Where is your focus and how do you use student feedback?

How big a role does student satisfaction play in programming at CISabroad? For 3rd party providers? For institutions?

Are there any common themes you notice in student feedback?

What is the need for a new student assessment at CIS?
In your opinion, how important would you say student reflection, student accountability (own the experience), and questions put in proper context are for a student assessment?

Do you feel the current student assessment effectively balances a need for questions that ask about student (customer) satisfaction outcomes and educational outcomes? Is there a need for this?

Do you think there is a current trend in education abroad overall to focus more on customer satisfaction than learning outcomes when designing, implementing, and evaluating programs?

How familiar are you with the following concepts: consumer-based v. educational goal-based evaluation models? Qualitative student assessment design? Component based questions?

What do you think the challenges are for student evaluation and assessment for a private third party provider? How about the challenges as compared to a study abroad office? Do you think the goals are different or similar?

**New Zealand Assessment Questions:**

Why was a program at the University of Otago started by CIS? Why does it continue to run? What makes Otago and attractive location for a CIS program?

What type of student typically is interested in a study abroad program in New Zealand? Otago?

How can we increase our numbers there?

What is the current market like for Otago with other providers? How do we stay competitive?
# Appendix F: Program Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/15</td>
<td>South Island Program Application Deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Application deadline for potential Participants for the Semester on the South Island Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/10</td>
<td>Online Predeparture Orientation (PT Assessment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Online pre-departure orientation implemented by CISabroad Program Coordinator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Electronic student assessment sent to assess the work of the Program Coordination Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/19 - 2/22</td>
<td>Participant Arrival and On-site Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A three night/four day on-site program orientation conducted in Wellington with the New Zealand Site Director. Included Semester on the North Island students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22 - 2/23</td>
<td>Arrival in Dunedin and International Student Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participant arrival in Dunedin. Airport pick-up conducted by University of Otago. Student Orientation is also provided by the University for all international students on the 22nd and 23rd of February.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/24</td>
<td>Classes Begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Classes start at the University of Otago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/11 - 3/14</td>
<td>Overnight Excursion (Christchurch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A three night/four day excursion to the city of Christchurch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/14 - 4/24</td>
<td>Semester Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ten day university-wide break in classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/7</td>
<td>Day Excursion (Otago Peninsula)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Full day excursion for Semester on the South Island program participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/19</td>
<td>Farewell Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A farewell meal that represents a closure to the program and reflection time for participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• End of Program paper assessment given to all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/7 - 6/21</td>
<td>University Of Otago Final Exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Two week exam period for all program participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/22</td>
<td>Participant Departure from Dunedin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants depart Dunedin and return home.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G: University of Otago Disability Information

International or Exchange students

If you are an international student with a permanent, recurring or temporary impairment, Disability Information & Support may be able to help you. We can provide you with learning support, advice, advocacy and information.

As with any other student enrolling at the University of Otago, it is important that you check to ensure that the University is able to meet your specific requirements. You need to be sure that the University can provide you with the type and level of support you are used to. Depending on your status there may be costs associated with some support services that you may need to self-fund, so it is extremely important that you make contact at the time you are applying for admission to the University of Otago.
Source: http://www.otago.ac.nz/disabilities/information/prospective-students/international/index.html

Appendix H: Student Code of Conduct

CISabroad CODE OF CONDUCT

While abroad, you are not only representing your home country, but CISabroad as well. For this reason, we expect all participants to behave in a legal manner that is respectful of other people, customs, and property. As a student, you are responsible for researching and understanding issues that relate to your respective host country’s laws, as well as the safety, health, political, and cultural conditions of the host country. While enrolled in a CISabroad program it is expected that participants will abide by the following code of conduct. Violation of this code will be met with appropriate disciplinary action, up to and including dismissal from the program.

Behavior Policy While in a foreign country, a U.S. citizen is subject to that country’s laws and regulations. That country may not afford the protections available under U.S. law. Any student convicted of a crime abroad can expect incarceration and/or fines. CISabroad will not assist in legal matters caused by a participant’s use of alcohol or drugs.
Appendix I: Cultural Curriculum Timeline

Onsite Orientation (Wellington)
2/19 - 2/22
• 2/19
  • 12-2PM Arrival
  • 2-5PM Settle In
  • 5:30PM Welcome Dinner
• 2/20
  • 9AM-12PM Orientation presentation
  • 1-3PM Walking Tour
  • 6PM Group Dinner
• 2/21
  • 9:30-11:30AM Maori Museum
  • 1-3PM Maori Haka Ceremony
  • 7PM Group Dinner
• 2/22
  • 8-10AM Information Review
  • 12PM Depart

Overnight Excursion (Christchurch)
3/11 - 3/14
• 3/11
  • 3-5PM Arrival
  • 7PM Dinner
• 3/12
  • 9-11:30AM Walking tour
  • 1-3PM Canterbury Museum
  • 6PM Cooking lesson
• 3/13
  • 8AM-4PM Day trip to Lyttleton Harbor/Quail Island
  • 6PM Group Dinner
• 3/14
  • 8AM review of weekend and next excursion
  • Return to Dunedin

Day Excursion (Otago Peninsula)
5/7
• 9-11AM Larnach Castle
• 11AM-1PM Travel and Lunch
• 1-4PM Taiaora Tour and Albatross/Blue Penguin Colony
• 6PM Dinner on the way home on the peninsula

Farewell Dinner (Dunedin)
6/19
• 4-6PM Farewell Dinner
• Structured discussion
• Program assessment (paper)
• What’s next
Appendix J: CISabroad Health and Safety Details

Conditions that Contribute to Risk Whether at Home or Abroad

Situations which place anyone at greatest risk are:
* Being out after midnight
* Being alone at night in an isolated area
* Being in a known high-crime area
* Sleeping in an unlocked place
* Being out after a local curfew
* Being intoxicated

Strategies Used by U.S. Students to Reduce Risk

You have most likely been using a variety of strategies to avoid harm while living in the United States and these will be useful overseas as well. These are:
* Listening for what is being said around you
* Keeping watch for suspicious people and vehicles
* Knowing what hours of the night are more dangerous than others
* Staying in and walking only in those areas that are well lit
* Avoiding being alone in unfamiliar neighborhoods
* Knowing where to get help (stores, phones, fire station, etc.)

Note: It is important to discuss the extent to which these strategies are or are not applicable during your time abroad.

Factors Placing Students at Risk Abroad

Your circumstance as a foreigner places you at some increased risk because you:
* Are new to this country
* May not speak the local language well
* Are traveling to new places and making new friends
* Will generally be traveling by public transportation
* Are curious about your new home and the new culture you are living in
* May stand out in a crowd
* Have not yet learned the best way to say no in this culture
* May not yet pick up the "clues" in this culture that you are in danger
* Have not yet established personal daily routines in your new home

Strategies for Reducing Risk

Safety is ultimately the responsibility of each individual student and you should actively develop your own personal safety strategies. Administrators and/or our CISabroad site directors can assist you in developing personal awareness and personal safety strategies. Some suggestions include:

On site:
* Establishing relationships with hosts, neighbors, and local authorities
* Improving structural security of residence (shuttered/barred window, door locks, sealed walls/ceilings, etc.)
* Ensuring access to emergency medical care
* Developing emergency support/communications network
* Screening visitors

**Traveling:**
* Notifying the international student office of travel plans
* Wearing prudent attire
* Restricting night travel
* Projecting certainty of route and destination
* Avoiding "high risk" regions
* Traveling with a friend/trusted other
* Establishing rapport with regular drivers
* Women sitting with other women or middle aged couples

**Urban Area:**
* Demonstrating vigilance/confidence/"street smarts"
* Being aware of surroundings
* Avoiding "high risk" areas
* Identifying "safe zones"
* Using "buddy system"
* Carrying whistle or other personal safety device
* Locating safe hotels/guest houses
* Moderating alcohol consumption
* Carrying only sufficient cash in safe place (pouch, money belt)

**Reporting:**
If you are a victim of an assault, reporting this incident to the host university emergency contact is important because:
* You may need medical attention
* You may need to or choose to talk with someone about what has happened
* You may want or need assistance in working with the local authorities
* You should be aware of whether the discussion is confidential

(The above guidelines were adapted from SAFETI's adaptation of Peace Corps resources.)

**Top 10 Tips for Students While Overseas**
In addition to the guidelines above, below are the "Top Ten Travel Tips for Students" as found in the brochure "State department travel tips for students", provided by the U.S. State Department.

1. Make sure you have a signed, valid passport and visas, if required. Also, before you go, fill in the emergency information page of your passport!
2. Read the Consular Information Sheets (and Public Announcements or Travel Warnings, if applicable) for the countries you plan to visit.
3. Make copies of your itinerary, passport data page and visas. Take one set with you and
leave a second set with family or friends at home, so that you can be contacted in case of an emergency. Keep your host program informed of your whereabouts.

4. Make sure you have insurance that will cover your emergency medical needs (including medical evacuation) while you are overseas.

5. Familiarize yourself with local laws and customs of the countries to which you are traveling. Remember, while in a foreign country, you are subject to its laws!

6. Do not leave your luggage unattended in public areas and never accept packages from strangers.

7. While abroad, avoid using illicit drugs or drinking excessive amounts of alcoholic beverages, and associating with people who do.

8. Do not become a target for thieves by wearing conspicuous clothing and expensive jewelry and do not carry excessive amounts of cash or unnecessary credit cards.

9. Deal only with authorized agents when you exchange money to avoid violating local laws.

10. When overseas, avoid demonstrations and other situations that may become unruly or where anti-American sentiments may be expressed.

Source: http://www.cisabroad.com/health-safety/safety-tips#anchor

Appendix K: CISabroad Student Insurance

CISabroad INSURANCE

While overseas it is important that you understand the health requirements of the country. As part of your pre-departure orientation you will be informed of all issues relating to medical care, insurance, and immunizations. It is also very important that you make CISabroad aware of any pre-existing health conditions that may impact you during your time abroad well before your departure. Announcement of any health conditions, either prior or existing, will not affect your admission to any CISabroad programs; quite the contrary, revealing this will allow for the host institution and CISabroad to make proper accommodations prior to your departure.

Medical treatment in a foreign country is not something we expect you to require, but should the need arise, we want to make sure you are adequately covered. The cost of medical and accident insurance, no matter where you study, is included in the program fee.

We include comprehensive overseas medical and accident insurance coverage for all our participants. Our coverage was designed in conjunction with Cultural Insurance Services International (CISI), and includes the following maximum benefits:

Accidental Death: $10,000
Basic Medical: $200,000 (no deductible)
Emergency Medical Reunion: $2,000
Medical Evacuation/Repatriation & Return of Mortal Remains: $150,000 (combined)

Source: http://www.cisabroad.com/health-safety/insurance#anchor
Appendix L: Emergency and Crisis Definitions

Definition of Emergency and Emergency Response Plan
An emergency is when the student is in a life-threatening situation or in a situation that may cause serious psychological or emotional trauma. If the problem can wait 24 hours, it is most likely not an emergency. This plan has been developed to provide information that will prepare all parties to work effectively in cases of emergency or crisis. Our Emergency Response Plan outlines exactly what CISabroad will do in the event of:

Major Crises:
- Natural Disasters
- Terrorism
- War
- Political Emergencies

Individual Crises:
- Life threatening accidents or illnesses
- Crimes against a student (rape, assault, mugging, etc.)
- Arrest of a student
- Death of a student
- Missing student

Crises in the U.S.
- Events in the U.S. that are not physical threats to participants abroad (individual or major crises)

Source: http://www.cisabroad.com/health-safety/cisabroad-emergency-procedures#anchor

Appendix M: Program Cancellation Policy

Suspension and Cancellation Policy
Cancellation or suspension of any program will result if:

- The US Department of State issues a travel warning advising US citizens not to travel to a particular country or, if in country, to leave
- CISabroad deems it necessary to cancel or suspend the program for any other reason (ex: the safety and welfare of the participants are in jeopardy).

In cases where CISabroad is forced to cancel or suspend a program, or in the case of serious documented illness, the following refund policies will be applied:

- If the program has not yet begun, all funds will be refunded, less the $200.00 application deposit and any non-recoverable housing/damage deposits.
- If the program has begun, CISabroad will refund any portion of the student's expense that has not been used or committed less the $200.00 application deposit.

Source: http://www.cisabroad.com/health-safety/cisabroad-emergency-procedures#anchor
Appendix N: Student Assessment Tools

Student Assessment Tool (Programs Team Assessment)

Semester on the South Island Program Staff Assessment
This evaluation is for all students participating in CISabroad programming. Thank you for your participation!

1. Program Start Month and Year:

2. Email Address:

U.S. Program Coordination Team
Tell CISabroad about your experience with the U.S. based programs staff!

3. My Program Coordination Team was helpful.
   * Mark only one oval.
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

4. My Program Coordination Team was available.
   * Mark only one oval.
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

5. My Program Coordination Team was responsive.
   * Mark only one oval.
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
8. My Program Coordination Team was knowledgeable.  
Mark only one oval.

☐ Strongly agree
☐ Agree
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly disagree

7. What would you want the Founder and Executive Director of CISabroad, Jeff Palm, to know about the Northampton Program Coordination Team?

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Semester on the South Island Program Assessment

This evaluation is for all students participating in CISabroad programming. Thank you for your participation!

1. Start Month and Year:
____________________________________________________________________

2. Home University:
____________________________________________________________________

3. Student Name:
____________________________________________________________________

4. Email Address:
____________________________________________________________________
CISabroad Orientations

5. Understanding that there will always be unanticipated challenges while living abroad, the CISabroad online pre-departure orientation prepared me for this program.
   Mark only one oval.
   ○ Strongly agree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Strongly disagree

6. The pre-departure orientation prepared me psychologically for the cross-cultural challenge ahead.
   Culture Shock- disoriented feeling experienced by someone who is suddenly subjected to an unfamiliar culture or way of life.
   Mark only one oval.
   ○ Strongly agree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Strongly disagree

7. What additional information would have been helpful to know prior to your experience abroad?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

8. The CISabroad on-site orientation prepared me for the challenges of living and studying abroad.
   Mark only one oval.
   ○ Strongly agree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Strongly disagree

9. Do you have any comments about your on-site orientation? Are there any aspects you would have changed?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Living Situation

10. While living in my housing, I felt safe.
   Mark only one oval.
   ○ Strongly agree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Strongly disagree

11. While walking around and spending time in the neighborhood where my housing was located, I felt safe.
   Mark only one oval.
   ○ Strongly agree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Strongly disagree

12. My living environment was considerably different from what I am used to at home.
   Mark only one oval.
   ○ Strongly agree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Strongly disagree

13. To what extent did the housing arrangements offer a forum of communication and personal bonding?
   Mark only one oval.
   ○ Very well
   ○ Well
   ○ Fairly well
   ○ Not at all

14. What did you feel was the most challenging aspect of your housing? Please explain.

__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
In Country On-Site Staff

Tell CISabroad about your Site Director!

15. My CISabroad on-site staff were available.
   Mark only one oval.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

16. My CISabroad on-site staff were knowledgeable.
   Mark only one oval.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

17. My CISabroad on-site staff were responsive.
   Mark only one oval.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

18. My CISabroad on-site staff were helpful.
   Mark only one oval.
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

19. If you have general comments about CISabroad on-site staff, please list below.
   How did your Site Director improve your experience?
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
Cultural Immersion

20. I was able to begin to understand local events and people from the perspective of the host culture.
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Strongly agree
   ☐ Agree
   ☐ Disagree
   ☐ Strongly disagree

21. The program’s CISabroad cultural immersion activities/excursions offered opportunities for connectedness and sharing with the local community.
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Strongly agree
   ☐ Agree
   ☐ Disagree
   ☐ Strongly disagree

22. To what degree were you able to take initiative outside program structured activities/excursions to meet and meaningfully interact with host nationals?
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Easily
   ☐ Somewhat easily
   ☐ With difficulty
   ☐ I was never able to

23. Which CISabroad program excursion/activity (including orientation), that you attended, allowed you the most immersion into local culture?
   Note: This question is asking for your most immersive excursion/activity, not your favorite, although they might be the same.

   _____________________________
   _____________________________
   _____________________________
   _____________________________
   _____________________________

Academics

24. The academic content of my program deepened my understanding of the location where I studied.
   Mark only one oval.
   ☐ Strongly agree
   ☐ Agree
   ☐ Disagree
   ☐ Strongly disagree
25. How easily were you able to adapt to the new academic style of your host nation and university?
   Mark only one oval.
   □ Easily
   □ With difficulty but I adapted
   □ I never got used to it
   □ I rejected it

26. What was the most challenging aspect of your academic experience?

27. I sought out opportunities to immerse myself in the host university or local community by joining clubs and attending events.
   Mark only one oval.
   □ Strongly agree
   □ Agree
   □ Disagree
   □ Strongly disagree

28. I learned to accept new ways of behaving and altered the routine I would normally have at my home college/university.
   Mark only one oval.
   □ Strongly agree
   □ Agree
   □ Disagree
   □ Strongly disagree
20. I was able to adapt to my new culture and its challenges, and although my experience was different and maybe at times uncomfortable, I was able to grow because of it.
Mark only one oval.

☐ Strongly agree
☐ Agree
☐ Disagree
☐ Strongly disagree

30. In which of the following ways has your study abroad experience impacted your life?
Check all that apply.

☐ Increased my self-confidence
☐ Increased my independence
☐ Further developed my interpersonal communication skills
☐ Expanded my curiosity of the world
☐ Enhanced my ability to think critically about culture and the world
☐ Acquisition of a greater understanding of my home cultural identity

31. What was the greatest challenge you faced on this program? How did you adapt to meet that challenge? What could CISabroad have done to help you meet that challenge, while still promoting personal, academic, and intercultural growth?

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

32. CISabroad can use my comments for marketing purposes.
Mark only one oval.

☐ Yes
☐ No

33. Would you be willing to share your email address with us and serve as a reference for students who are interested in your program?
Mark only one oval.

☐ Yes
☐ No

34. Can't wait to share your experience abroad? Then join our Alumni Ambassador program and inspire others to have their own life-changing adventure! Check YES below to be contacted and receive more information.
Mark only one oval.

☐ Yes
☐ No
Appendix O: South Island Program Assessment and Evaluation Process

- **August 15th - 16th**: Programs Team Assessment Summit
- **August - November**: CISabroad Fall Programs
  - Run and implements
  - Student Assessments
- **July 30th - August 15th**: Data Specialist prepares assessment data (Student, Program Coordinator, & Site Director)
- **July 5th**: Internal Program Assessment sent to Program Coordinator and Site Director
- **June 30 - July 15th**: Paper Student Assessments digitized and compiled for PT Analysis by Data Specialist
- **June 19th**: End of Program Student Assessment given by Site Director at Farewell Dinner
- **February 10th**: South Island Programs Team Student Assessment given in Pre-departure Orientation
- **December 15th**: Mid-Year Program Assessment and Evaluation of Action Goals by Programs Team
# Appendix P: Budget and Budget Notes

## Semester on the South Island Budget

### Charged Program Fees (U.S. Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Fee (12-15 credits)</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excursion Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site Orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excursion Fees</td>
<td>$129.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome Dinner</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodations</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$244.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christchurch Excursion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homestays</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance fees</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>$130.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otago Peninsula Day Trip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excursion Fees</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farewell Dinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meal</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excursion Fees Total</strong></td>
<td>$654.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excursion and Tuition Total</strong></td>
<td>$9,654.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15 weeks)</td>
<td>$3,232.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accommodations Total</strong></td>
<td>$3,232.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Total Tuition, Fees, and Accommodations

Total Tuition, Fees, and Accommodations $ 12,886.00

### Staffing and Additional Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Director</td>
<td>$ 1,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton Staff</td>
<td>$ 2,182.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Expenses</td>
<td>$ 122.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated staffing expenses are per program participant. Staff expenses equal 12% of total program price.

## Total Staffing and Additional Expenses $ 3,654.00

### Additional Student Expenses Not Charged by CISabroad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meals</td>
<td>$ 1,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books and Supplies</td>
<td>$ 350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Spending</td>
<td>$ 800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expenses</td>
<td>$ 2,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Expenses are an estimate for students traveling, living, and studying on the South Island program.

## Total Additional Participant Expenses $ 4,950.00

## Total Tuition, Fees, and Accommodations $ 12,886.00

### Total Staff Cost $ 3,654.00

### Margin of Program Profit $ 1,650.00

## Total Program Price Charged $ 18,190.00

### Total Additional Participant Expenses $ 4,950.00

## Total CIS Price and Estimated Additional Costs Per Program Participant $ 23,140.00

### Budget Notes:

* All prices are in U.S. dollars.
* Exchange rate 4/3/16: 1 USD = .70 NZD
* Prices are for an individual program participant
  - Charged Program Fees – All fees directly billed to students for the program
    - **Tuition Fee**
Tuition charged by the University of Otago for one semester of coursework. The price is constant for full time students at $9,000. Students must take a minimum of 12 credits and are allowed to take a maximum of 16 credits.

**Excursion Costs**

**On-site Orientation (Wellington)**

**Accommodations** - Prearranged hostel in the city and the price is $25 a night, $50 total  
**Transportation** - From the airport to Wellington along with all transportation within Wellington is $35. Estimated using price per city bus fare and typical cab fares  
**Excursions** – Museum of New Zealand ($14); Wellington Walking Tour ($40); Maori Haka Ceremony ($75)  
**Welcome Dinner** - $30 average meal at typical restaurant in Wellington

**Christchurch Excursion**

**Accommodations** – Homestays at friends of family in Christchurch. While there is no official fee given to homestay families (friends of the SD), $50 will be given to cover costs.  
**Transportation** – Bus transportation from Dunedin to Christchurch was estimated at $80 roundtrip from Intercity Bus Company. A $20 bus/metro card will be purchased from transportation within the city. The ferry price to Quail Island in Lyttleton Harbor is priced at $30 round trip. Ferry service provided by Black Cat Cruises  
**Excursions** – Canterbury Museum is free but accepts donations ($10); Christchurch Walking Tour is also free and provided by the municipality.  
**Group Dinners** - $25 average meal at typical restaurant in Christchurch. Two meals provided totaling $50.

**Otago Peninsula Day Excursion**

**Transportation** – Rented vehicle. The price will vary on the number of students but projected at $35 a student  
**Excursions** – Larnach Castle ($30); Taiaroa Tour and Albatross Colony ($50)  
**Group Dinner** - $25 average meal at typical restaurant in Dunedin

**Farewell Dinner (Dunedin)**

Farewell dinner priced at $30 a student at a typical restaurant in Dunedin

**Accommodations**

**Apartment (Flats) Rental**

The rental price for a flat in Dunedin for 15 weeks is $3,232 and covers the students housing for the entire semester. Price is the currently negotiated CISabroad rate with the University of Otago.

- Staffing Cost and Additional CIS Expenses
Site Director

The Site Director is paid a pre-negotiated amount per student enrolled in the program. For the Semester on the South Island, the Site Director is compensated $1,000 USD per program participant. An additional $350 USD is provided to the Site Director for program related travel from Dunedin to Wellington and Christchurch.

Northampton Staffing and Additional CIS Expenses

Since CISabroad has dozens of employees, it’s difficult to estimate the exact amount of money from a student’s fees will go towards Northampton staffing. A conservative estimate of 12% of the student’s billable fees will go towards Northampton Staffing. 12% of the total $18,190 price equals $2,182 for Northampton staffing.

Additional Expenses

These additional expenses include the student insurance policy CIS subscribes to, Northampton building utilities and office space rental cost.

- Additional Student Expenses Not Charged by CISabroad
  
  **Meals**

  Students are responsible for all their own meals while living in Dunedin. CISabroad recommends $1,800 dollars per student for food over the 15 weeks. This breaks down to $17.14 per day for food.

  **Books and Supplies**

  CISabroad recommends $350 for books and other class supplies.

  **Personal Spending**

  Personal spending will vary greatly from student to student given their level of financial support and available resources. CIS recommends students bring approximately $800 to spend on personal expenses.

  **Travel Expenses**

  Air travel to New Zealand is expensive. CISabroad approximates most students will spend upwards of $2000 on air travel and its related expenses.

*Additional Note: A number of Scholarships exist for students to travel and study in New Zealand. Scholarships are provided by the government of New Zealand.*