

CASE STUDIES IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

CSIEpub.org *An open-access online publication*

Spring 2021

VOLUME 2 ISSUE 1



About CSIE

Case Studies in International Education (CSIE) is an open access, online, peer-reviewed publication that utilizes case studies for the development and advancement of the field. CSIE seeks to promote further professional development through engaging case study discussion. We offer publication opportunities for scholar-practitioners, including working professionals, faculty, and graduate students at CSIEpub.org. Each case study provides an opportunity to integrate theory and practice through interdisciplinary analysis/insight for the benefit of the field's future growth.

International education is defined by Punteney (2019) as "the profession of designing, managing, and facilitating programs and activities that help participants to appropriately, effectively, and ethically engage in interactions with culturally diverse people and ideas, often across national borders."

Editorial Board

Katherine Punteney

Editor in Chief

Professor & Program Chair, International Education Management
Middlebury Institute of International Studies

Eleanor Vogt

Managing Editor

Middlebury Institute of International Studies

In Appreciation

The editorial board wishes to thank the Middlebury Institute of International Studies for providing financial support for start-up costs for CSIE and providing on-going sponsorship of the CSIE website.



Middlebury Institute of
International Studies at Monterey

Fading Oasis:

Weathering Big Changes in an ISS Office

Morgan Keller

Assistant Director of Student Transitions and Co-curricular Education, UW-Madison International Student Services, Madison, WI, U.S.A.
 Email: morgan.keller@wisc.edu

Tags

Crisis-Management; Education Policy; Ethics, Equity, and Social Justice; International Student and Scholar Services; Leadership and Strategy; Management and Operations; Personnel Management; Student Services; University/Higher Education

Setting

Morning Glory University (MGU) is a large, top-25 R1 research university in the U.S. with a total student body of more than 40,000. The Office of Advising Services for International Students (OASIS) provides immigration advising and student success programming for its Global Storks (MGU's mascot is the stork) community of more than 7,000 F-1 and J-1 visa holders. OASIS has been part of the Division of Student Affairs' Inclusion, Equity, and Identity (IEI) subdivision for more than 30 years, which has fostered a mission and office culture dedicated to these principles and allowed the unit to implement a strong portfolio of student-centered programs.

However, as a result of a Chancellor-mandated steering committee's multi-month inquiry into the state of immigration services at the University, it was recently decided that OASIS and International Scholar and Employee Services (ISES), a unit within Human Resources which solely provides immigration advising and document processing services, would both transition to the Division of International Affairs (DIA) and share an office space for centralization purposes. In contrast to Student Affairs, DIA is situated within the Academic Affairs branch of MGU and has a mission primarily focused on enhancing global learning across the University's curriculum by helping faculty integrate best practices; expanding international partnerships and academic linkages; and increasing exchange and study abroad participation.

Coinciding with this transition is the recent hiring of OASIS' new permanent director, Dr. Lyla Gallagher. Gallagher was an external candidate for the position and shined throughout the interview process by demonstrating her comprehensive knowledge of F and J visa regulations and extensive experience innovating services and programs for international students. She has a doctorate in intercultural education and came to MGU after six years of serving as Director of International Student and Scholar Services (ISSS) at Wonderwall

College, a campus internationalization award-winning, small liberal arts institution well-known for its proportionately large and diverse international student body and high study abroad participation rate.

Case

It has been a tumultuous two months since OASIS transitioned to DIA. MGU and OASIS have been in the national news, unfortunately not for positive press. A recent Global Stork graduate has filed a lawsuit against the University, claiming that she was misadvised by an OASIS advisor about the deadline to apply for Optional Practical Training (OPT), and as a result, will miss out on three years of post-completion employment with a high profile tech company that recruited her.

OASIS is also under fire in the campus community. *Signed, Sealed, Delivered by Stork*, the University's student-run newspaper, recently ran a front-page feature story lambasting OASIS. In the article, titled "OASIS Services Just a Mirage for International Students," Global Stork members of the MGU Student Governance Association's leadership team are quoted as criticizing OASIS for its "snail pace" 15-business day request processing time and limited advising appointments, despite the \$100 international student fee they must pay each semester. The article and the news of the lawsuit seem to have struck a nerve with other Global Storks disgruntled with OASIS' services, some of whom have contacted the Office of the Chancellor to air their grievances.

"Who Put the Weight of the World on My Shoulders?"

With campus at a boiling point and pressure from the Chancellor, the DIA Dean meets with Gallagher for a serious discussion about how OASIS will improve its services to begin repairing its reputation. He demands that for the foreseeable future OASIS function as an immigration advising and paperwork processing office like their colleagues in ISES. He also gives the order that weekly advising hours be doubled and all requests be processed within 7 business days. Additionally, he shares that, due to the economic impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and a much lower enrollment projection for the Fall 2021 Global Stork cohort, all OASIS programs will be indefinitely suspended, with the exception of new student orientation, along with professional development opportunities for staff.

Complicating matters for Gallagher, two of her senior staff members, an associate director and senior international student advisor, recently departed the office dropping their team to 13 professional staff members (including herself). Her current staff now includes:

- 1 Assistant Director of International Student Engagement
- 1 International Programs Coordinator
- 1 Advisor and International Peer Mentorship Program Coordinator (hybrid 50/50 role)
- 1 Advisor and Intercultural Speakers Program Coordinator (hybrid 50/50 role)
- 1 Data Specialist
- 1 Administrative Assistant
- 6 International Student Advisors (three of whom are new ISAs that started in the last six months)

Even though all her staff members have Designated School Official (DSO)/Alternate Responsible Officer (ARO) authorization and access to the Student and Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS), Gallagher's mind is in a supersonic tailspin pondering how they will be able to adjust roles and maximize efficiency to meet the advising and paperwork needs of their massive Global Stork community, while adhering to the 7-business day processing time. She also knows that, despite these demanding service changes and being understaffed, she must soon start the hiring process for her two permanent staff vacancies.

Complicating matters further, with summer and the end of the fiscal year on the horizon, many of her staff have accumulated leave that expires at the end of the June. The Assistant Director of International Student Engagement and one of the ISAs have already been pre-approved for month-long vacations to visit their families in Asia whom they have not seen in many years. It dawns on her that while her Assistant Director is on vacation, she will be responsible for supervising the entire staff in addition to all her other responsibilities as Principal Designated School Official (PDSO)/Responsible Officer (RO) and director of the unit. Gallagher never

CSIE cases are offered as professional development for readers and are not meant to focus on specific individuals or organizations. Names and other identifying details within the cases have been changed. In some instances, cases may have been amalgamated.

Article reuse guidelines: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

experienced such a perfect storm of crises during her tenure at Wonderwall College and feels as if already the weight of the world is on her shoulders in her new role.

Knowing she must take action soon and feeling apprehensive about how staff will respond to the changes in services, she consults the Assistant Director of International Student Engagement. He is shocked by the drastic measures Gallagher intends to announce and implement. He tells her this will be a tremendous burden and source of stress for their already overworked staff. The Assistant Director also says he is “deeply concerned” about how this shift will impact OASIS’ engagement and student success support for Global Storks, as well as the morale of his passionate coworkers whose roles are focused on programming. He ends their conversation with: “With all due respect, some of us aren’t just in this field to issue I-20s and advise on CPT. Our students have real needs that go beyond immigration advising and processing paperwork. Not providing this support, which has always been part of our mission, is a major disservice to thousands of our students and our staff, too.”

At their next staff meeting, Gallagher announces the changes dictated by the Dean, including doubling advising hours, the new 7-business day processing time expectation, and the indefinite moratorium on all OASIS engagement activities, including the peer mentorship and intercultural speakers programs, except for new student orientation. She also explains that due to the heavy workload, shortage of staff, and budgetary shortfall, all professional development is on hold through at least the end of the next fiscal year. She adds that their weekly staff-wide social justice and student development conversations, formerly an OASIS goal and practice when they were affiliated with Student Affairs’ IEI subdivision, will also be discontinued to maximize time for advising, processing, and document production services.

In the week since the staff meeting, a number of OASIS team members have reached out to Gallagher and requested to meet to discuss the announced changes. Those working in programming, in particular, have questioned and voiced their concern about this sea change and the implications for their important work in student engagement as well as OASIS’ mission. Gallagher has heard desperate pleas and fervent remonstrations from her colleagues and seen a few of them break down in tears. Having started her career as a programming coordinator in an ISSS office many years ago—a job she adored—she now feels deeply conflicted about these sacrifices and how they will impact the Global Stork experience for many as well as the morale of her staff. She senses a very challenging road ahead, like crossing a great desert, that will ultimately shape the mission and future of OASIS.

Discussion Questions

As you consider this case, discuss:

- How might cultural differences between Student Affairs, Academic Affairs, and institutional leadership affect this case?
- What lessons can we take away from how decisions were made and handled by institutional leadership in this case?
- With the service changes, work volume, staffing challenges, and budgetary restrictions, how might the director bolster staff morale to avoid further attrition?
- To what degree are crisis management and change tolerance complicating factors for the director and her staff in this case, and how might growth in these areas be facilitated for them?
- Which services provided by ISSS offices, such as immigration advising, document production, orientation, programming, etc., should be prioritized and why?
- In ISSS offices which primarily provide immigration services, should social justice and student development discussions and trainings be expected of staff and incorporated into their work, including advising and programming?

- How can ISSS offices best balance the sometimes incongruous relationship between upholding federal regulations and institutional policy and advocating for international student and scholar equity, inclusion, and success?
- In what ways can a divisional transition impact the mission, services, and culture of an ISSS office, and how can this benefit or disadvantage international students and scholars?
- Bonus question: What legendary British rock band is subliminally referenced throughout this case study?

Bonus Question Answer: Oasis

References: "Morning Glory" (song from the album *What's the Story Morning Glory?*), "Lyla" (song), "Wonderwall" (song), "Supersonic" (song), "Who Put the Weight of the World on My Shoulders?" (song), "Gallagher" (last name of Liam and Noel, Oasis's band-leading brothers)

Can I Say No?

Navigating Race and Power As A New Advisor

Danai N. Sakutukwa

International Education Professional, San Francisco Bay Area, CA, USA

Email: dnsakutukwa@gmail.com

Tags

Cross-Cultural Issues; Ethics, Equity, and Social Justice; International Student and Scholar Services; Management and Operations; Personnel Management; University/Higher Education

Setting

The Office of International Services (OIS) is responsible for providing advising, immigration services, and programming to the international student population of a large public research university. The team is comprised of a director, a human resources administrator, and nine student and scholar advisors.

There are 6,000 international students at the university, and enrollment has increased considerably over the last five years. Cassie has been an advisor at the OIS for four years, and was recently promoted to Assistant Director of Student Services. She has been spearheading discussions about hiring another advisor, as the advising team has been struggling with meeting the increasing demand for their services. They will also need additional support for their 'peak' season, which lies in the few months before they welcome thousands of new students for the Fall semester. She gains approval from the OIS director to bring on another team member, and within a few weeks, Zoe – an immigrant-born Black cis-female who has recently completed a Master's degree program in International Development - is hired. It is agreed that she will report to Cassie. This will be Cassie's first time serving as a supervisor.

Case

Cassie and Zoe meet to review her new responsibilities, and how Zoe will support the team during peak season. Cassie believes that Zoe would also be a 'good fit' for two projects in particular. First, she would like

for Zoe to act as the OIS 'liaison' to all 98 international student clubs on campus. Cassie explains to Zoe that she perceives her as 'naturally friendly', and that she will be able to relate to the students well. She also believes Zoe could help pull in students that have been historically challenging for the office to connect with. As an example, she cites the African Student Union.

Cassie would also like for her to solely coordinate the OIS's International Student Peer Mentorship Program. With almost 300 members, she warns that managing the entire cycle of the program will be a 'unique challenge' if she is 'up for it'. She reiterates that Zoe's friendly disposition and perceived ability to relate to students make her the best fit for this project.

Both projects are public-facing, with considerable event planning involved. During an initial conversation earlier that week, Cassie asked Zoe what her goals for her new position were. Zoe admitted to Cassie that she is an 'introvert' with little confidence in her programming abilities, and that she hopes to be able to use her time at the OIS to build her immigration and advising skills instead. Zoe refers to this conversation, but Cassie insists that despite the magnitude of these projects, she will excel at both. She also reminds Zoe that all advisors have a programming requirement to fulfill. Zoe reluctantly agrees to lead both projects. Cassie tells Zoe that she will need to work overtime to manage the projects. She directs her to their HR administrator, Maria, to formally request overtime approval.

A few days later Zoe meets with Maria. Maria explains that Zoe can accrue overtime in either additional vacation hours or monetary compensation. Zoe wants monetary compensation, but Maria explains that she will likely be denied approval due to the OIS's limited budget. Reluctantly, Zoe opts to request for additional vacation hours, and is approved.

Shortly before applying to the OIS, Zoe attended a large international education and development conference in Washington D.C.. There, she attended a session led by Black and Latino higher education professionals entitled *Being Black and Brown In The Ivory Tower: Pathways To Success for Young P.O.C. Professionals in Higher Education*. The speakers led a segment teaching attendees how to manage instances when teams make their black and brown colleagues responsible for public-facing diversity and inclusion work that does not align with their own professional goals. One of the speakers – a Black cis-female professor at another public research university – became a mentor to Zoe. Zoe contacts her, and discusses her meeting with Cassie. She admits that as the only black and immigrant-born person on her team, she feels she is being unfairly loaded with large programming projects that use her as a way to make students feel like the OIS is 'relatable' and diverse. Zoe's mentor believes that to be the case. She also confides that she was afraid to not take the projects because she doesn't want to be seen as combative or uncooperative. Zoe's mentor empathizes, and also expresses her discomfort with Zoe not being monetarily compensated for the additional work.

Six months into her role as advisor, Zoe is overwhelmed with her peak season workload and the two projects. Cassie has approved one hour of overtime a day. However, at their following weekly check-in, she warns Zoe that she cannot exceed a certain amount of overtime, and begins discussing time-management skills. Zoe explains that her work-load from the two programming projects, and not her time management, is her challenge. In an effort not to appear combative, Zoe then presents current and historical data she has gathered that shows decreasing enrollment numbers for the peer mentorship program over the past five years, and a decreasing amount of communication between the international student clubs on campus and the OIS liaison over the same period. She suggests either downsizing both programs, or outright eliminating them for the immediate future. However, Cassie emphasizes that the OIS Director insists that these programs remain as is, and that the OIS especially needed to produce inclusive programming for international students in this current

'climate'. She then continues to share time management skills with Zoe, because she would also like for her to lead an upcoming community service event that the office organizes annually.

Two months later, Zoe feels unable to keep up with the demands of her position. She formally resigns, explaining to Cassie that the position ultimately did not align with her professional goals. A month later, she obtains another position outside of higher education.

Discussion Questions

As you consider this case, discuss:

- Does it matter who the 'face' of the programming at an international office is? Why or why not?
- As a supervisor and part of the dominant culture, what responsibility does Cassie have in developing an understanding of racial and ethnic power dynamics in a team, or in the higher education field at large?
- What additional methods, if any, could Zoe have used to initially decline the two programming projects?
- Was it necessary for Zoe to resign, or could she have found another way to manage her situation?
- If there is only one team member outside of the dominant culture in an office, how can the team intentionally create a 'safe' space for that colleague?
- What groups support and advocate for higher education or international education professionals who identify as people of color? How can you engage with these groups?
- How could the international education field prepare new professionals to negotiate compensation and workload at the time of hiring and beyond?

Who Belongs?

International Students' Feeling of Belonging in Canadian Higher Education Institutions

Eunjung Riauka, BA., M.Ed.

Coordinator, Global Engagement & Mobility, Internationalization Lead.
Algoma University, Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, Canada
eunjung.riauka@algonau.ca

Tags

Crisis-Management; Cross-Cultural Issues; International Student and Scholar Services; Internationalization and Global Learning; Student Services; University/Higher Education

Setting

This case occurs within the context of a small to a medium-sized public university in Canada. The university has a population of 5,000 students of which over 30% are international. This university offers three different styles of on-campus residence. One of these housing options provides both international and domestic students with the opportunity to share a common room, kitchen and two bathrooms in a townhouse style. This residence provides a cozy feel where students have the opportunity to share and connect during their university life. Domestic students are defined as students that self-identify as born and raised in Canada, and international students are defined as students that self-identify as not from Canada and typically hold study permits or visas.

Case

Michiko is an 18-year-old international student from Japan. After she participated in a Canadian study tour during her senior year of high school, she began looking forward to studying abroad in Canada. She loved the ethnic diversity of Toronto, the majestic trees and greenery of Vancouver, and the welcoming and friendly Canadian people she met during her three-week tour. After these experiences, she was determined to study in Canada. She chose to take her undergraduate degree at this university as they offered the specialized program she was interested in. Her future plan was to apply for a graduate program either in Canada or in the CSIE cases are offered as professional development for readers and are not meant to focus on specific individuals or organizations. Names and other identifying details within the cases have been changed. In some instances, cases may have been amalgamated. Article reuse guidelines: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

U.S. to continue with her education. She reasoned that completing an undergraduate degree in Canada would provide her with the best opportunity to advance her post-graduation education plans.

Michiko wasn't 100% confident in her English abilities, so she decided to choose an on-campus residence accommodation with the hope of interacting with more Canadian students to improve her English and develop meaningful friendships.

One day, after a late afternoon class, Michiko went to her residence to prepare for dinner before her night class. She noticed that all her Canadian roommates had already gotten together and finished dinner before she arrived. She felt bad that they had pre-arranged this plan and cooked dinner together without extending an invitation to her. Michiko felt left out. She prepared a quick meal and ate alone in her room.

The next morning, Michiko overheard her roommates planning a dinner party on the weekend. Michiko felt alone and was upset that again she was not included in the conversation. To avoid feeling left out again, Michiko decided not to go to her residence for dinner on Saturday night and instead ate dinner at the student cafeteria with another Japanese student.

The following week, Michiko was in a class and the professor asked the students to form groups of 4 to 5 teammates to work on a project. Each group was quickly formed and Michiko ended up joining a few other international students in the class. Michiko felt it was not fair that none of the international students were invited to join domestic students' groups but neither the professor nor the domestic students seemed to care. Michiko wanted to speak out but since she was struggling with English she decided not to. Besides, she was not comfortable with challenging her professor or classmates, since this is not common in Japanese culture.

Michiko started to experience a mental health breakdown. She began retreating from all social activities and classes, and wasn't eating well or taking care of herself. After a series of unsuccessful attempts to reach their daughter, Michiko's parents reached out to Michiko's Japanese friends to check in on her. Michiko's Japanese friends discovered that Michiko was suffering from depression and social anxiety and informed Michiko's parents accordingly.

Michiko decided not to seek help from the university counseling office because admitting there was something wrong with her mental health is considered taboo in her home country. This would be seen as a significant weakness and would, ultimately, bring shame to her family and culture. Through these experiences, she had feelings of low self-worth and didn't feel as if she belonged to the university, culture, and classes she attended. Her struggles were exacerbated due to the language barrier she was experiencing causing frustration and feelings of inadequacy in the fact that she couldn't express her feelings freely to her classmates, professors and roommates. After finding out Michiko's condition, Michiko's parents decided to withdraw her from the school and bring her back to Japan for treatment.

Discussion Questions

As you consider this case, discuss:

- What impact did the roommates' behavior have on Michiko's feelings of belonging at the university?
- How do you think Michiko or the Canadian roommates could have approached the living situation differently?

- Could the school have done anything differently to mitigate potential issues like this during the early stage of residence life? For example, what process/ procedures could the school have in place to identify the early signs of being at-risk, as well as providing necessary intervention?
- What could the professors have done differently with a diverse, in-class student population working on a group project?
- What can schools do to make the campus environment, inside and outside of the classroom, more inclusive of all students?
- What type of cross-unit collaboration (e.g. with international office or counseling services) could have taken place to support Michiko?
- Do you think any cultural differences influenced Michiko's withdrawal from the university?

Professionally Pulling Staples:

An Intern Abroad Stuck Between Doing the Right Thing and Risking Professional Relationships

Marie Macdonald

Pack Alliance Company, Dominican Republic

Email: jane.marie.macdonald@gmail.com

Tags

Cross-Cultural Issues, Education Abroad, Leadership and Strategy, Management and Operations, Personnel Management

Setting

SOL Study Abroad Center ('The Center') is based in South America. The Center hosts university student groups and individuals for short and long-term study abroad programs. The Center was created over 30 years ago and has been growing into an accredited university study abroad organization that focuses on social and environmental studies. The Center was founded by a U.S. male, Marco, and he is and has been the CEO and Director since its creation.

The team at The Center includes Marco, six local staff, and an occasional U.S. intern. Marco has worked with some of the local staff members for several years and some for more than 10 years. The local staff are friendly, intelligent, experienced professionals that work extremely well with the visiting students to help them adapt to South America and The Center's programs. Living and working in the country for so many years, Marco claims he has strong relationships with the locals and treats them like family. He is proud that his center mostly employs locals.

Jessica is a U.S. college student majoring in International Development and minoring in Spanish. Her background is in Latin American Studies, Community Engagement, and Spanish language. She is living in South America for a semester on a credit-based placement and is working as an intern for The Center. Jessica was selected to receive a scholarship from her university for this internship position. Her primary contact and connection is with Marco and he has given her the title of *Program Associate and Support*. She knows that she has the knowledge, resources, and experience to connect with the local culture and do great work at The Center. Jessica is excited to get to work and use her research, studies, and Spanish language at The Center.

Case

After months of preparation, Jessica arrived in South America and began her semester-long internship. She spent a week adjusting to her new home and got settled in quickly since she has lived with many host families before. Jessica was welcomed into The Center by Marco and was introduced to all of the local staff. She was the only U.S. intern at The Center during her time there. Everybody was friendly, helpful, and generous during Jessica's transition at The Center. She made friendships with her local colleagues right away. After about a week of getting familiar with operations, Jessica was eager to begin to use her professional skills and expertise to support The Center's programs and projects.

The Center held weekly team meetings, however, there was a tremendous lack of direction and instruction between Marco and Jessica. She found herself constantly looking for work, shadowing local staff, sitting in on student classrooms, and trying to fill her free time with subsidiary projects. Jessica was autonomous and could work fine on her own but there were not any significant projects, tasks, assignments, or responsibilities delegated to her. Jessica would seek direction from Marco and he would ask her to complete mindless tasks like pulling staples from old documents, recycling used paper, cleaning out filing cabinets, and answering the front desk phone. All the other staff were very busy and even stressed with their own work in their particular departments within the office.

Jessica felt frustrated, underwhelmed, and shocked by the lack of leadership and work there was for her at The Center. She tried to start new projects, make suggestions for the office, and help facilitate the programs at The Center but she always felt like just a receptionist. She sought comfort in the local staff who she considered friends and often spent time getting to know them outside of work. She would eat lunch with them, ask about their families and interests, and share quality time with them as much as she could. She considered them her closest companions during the internship program. Marco, being seen as The Center's founder and boss of everyone, was more detached with the local staff and didn't make the effort to get to know them on a personal level. He never ate lunch with the staff and always was running in and out of the office without anyone knowing where he was going.

The work-life relationship was awkward for Jessica and Marco because he would kindly invite her out for family weekend trips or holiday lunches and she accepted even though she resented the work he made her do at The

Center. Jessica felt strange accepting his invitations out since she noticed he never invited the locals (plus, she didn't want to sound impolite or get on his 'bad side' since she needed his professional recommendation after the internship). Marco's intentions were friendly and his wife and children always accompanied him but Jessica felt like he wasn't giving the locals the same invitation even though they've worked at The Center for so long. When Jessica would pack up her things and leave with Marco at lunch, the local staff would seem annoyed and roll their eyes, as if they've seen this happen many times before.

Discussion Questions

As you consider this case, discuss:

- What issues are present in this case?
- How could communication and connection be improved between student intern and Director? Director and local staff?
- What would you have done if you were Jessica?
- What roles did nationality and race play in this situation? What about status and privilege?
- What intercultural activities or training could help improve the work environment at The Center?
- How can Jessica report this issue to her university without harming her relationship with the Director? What steps could her home university take to mediate the situation?

Crossing Cultural Conventions: The Line Between Education and Discipline

Linny Tran

Middlebury Institute of International Studies, Monterey, CA, United States
Email: linnyltran@gmail.com

Tags

Cross-Cultural Issues; Ethics, Equity, and Social Justice; Language Education; Primary and Secondary Education; Student Learning and Development

Setting

Every year, a medium-sized city in Japan receives more than 100 foreign Assistant Language Teachers (ALTs) from all around the world to teach English at nursery schools, kindergartens, elementary schools, and junior high schools in the city. At most schools, there are four administrators who sit at the front of the staff room. Among those top administrators, the vice principals (VPs) manage the performance of the ALTs, regardless of their English abilities. The ALTs may or may not have any Japanese language skills. Hence, the ALTs often have to rely on Japanese Teachers of English (JTEs) for translation and interpretation.

Emily is a teacher from New York, aspiring to become a cultural ambassador via English language education. She also strives to be a positive influence on the lives of young Japanese students. Emily works at several elementary schools and junior high schools not too far from where she lives. She teaches English to over 500 elementary school students and 1,000 junior high school students. At the elementary schools, Emily is given full freedom for her lessons – she can teach whatever she wants and however she wants, as long as they are appropriate and meet learning objectives set by the prefectural board of education. On the other hand, at the junior high level, she serves as an assistant to the JTE, co-teaching with them while the JTEs take the lead in course designing and lesson planning. At the primary education level, English education is often comprised of singing, dancing, rhythmic chanting, and many physical games. The homeroom teachers for each class assist the ALT in demonstrating activities and supervising students. At the secondary level, the ALT is expected to demonstrate her native speaking skills and support the JTEs in a structured format of instruction.

Case

One of the junior high schools Emily teaches at is lower ranked compared to others in the city. The school's previous ALTs were not well liked. They either quit in the middle of the academic year or put in minimal effort to interact with the students and Japanese coworkers. Emily, however, is on her fourth year working at the school. She alternates eating lunch with the students in the classrooms and with the Japanese teachers in the staff lounge. She also joins students in their after-school club activities to further build relationships outside of the classroom. She makes an effort to connect with every student. As a result, most students begin to grow fond of Emily and occasionally English as a school subject.

The school is known for having more than a few students with behavioral issues. In Japanese culture, students are taught to be disciplined from very young ages. Students must greet and bow to every adult; knock before entering the staff room; excuse themselves politely when exiting the staff room; and clean their classrooms. If students fail to follow these expectations, the teachers will typically handle the situations. Special cases may be brought to administrators.

Ryo is a second-year student at the junior high school. He often comes to school late, sleeps in class, never finishes his cleaning duties, and rarely follows any rules. In other words, he does not bow and greet every adult, enters the staff room without knocking and exits without politely excusing himself. When it comes to English, he has no interest in the subject and ignores Emily whenever she attempts to connect with him.

One day, Emily notices Ryo entering the staff room, followed by the vice principal (VP). The VP leads Ryo into the staff lounge and closes the door. Emily goes onto her regular teaching schedule as usual. After one class period, she heads back to the staff room for her break and hears the VP's raised voice echoing from the staff lounge. She does not understand what the VP is saying, but her concern grows as she continues to hear banging noises and more of the VP's voice in increasingly louder volumes. She makes eye contact with a Japanese teacher who happens to be in the staff room as well. She gestures for the two to leave together. Later, Emily brings up the incident with a JTE, who tells her to not worry about it.

Emily does not see Ryo at school for the next few days. However, the day that Ryo comes back to school, Emily notices evident differences in his behavior. He gets to school on time, no longer sleeps in class but just zones out instead, and he quietly knocks and excuses himself when entering and exiting the staff room. He still ignores Emily and only reluctantly greets other teachers when asked. The biggest change Emily has noticed is that Ryo appears to be even more secluded now. He never appeared outgoing or extremely extroverted before, but now he seems to be even more hesitant to interact with his classmates and friends.

Discussion Questions

As you consider this case, discuss:

- What do you think the issues are in this case?
- What would you do if you were Emily? What complications might there be?
- What are the different power dynamics in this case? How do they affect the situation?
- What role does culture play here? How might it influence Ryo's case?

Defusing the Zoombomb:

A Discussion of Countering Virtual Attacks in an Intercultural Program Setting

Sayre Weir

Programming Coordinator, University of Georgia, Athens, GA, USA
Email: sayreweir@gmail.com

Tags

Crisis-Management; Cross-Cultural Issues; Ethics, Equity, and Social Justice; International Student and Scholar Services; Management and Operations; Student Services; Technology; University/Higher Education

Setting

This situation occurs within the context of a large R1 research university in the United States. The university has over 2,500 international students on a campus of 40,000 total students. A department within the university seeks to internationalize the campus experience for all students and oversees a variety of programs that support international students, build connections between international and domestic students, and promote intercultural learning on campus.

This case study takes place during the COVID-19 pandemic, in which the majority of programming and student support occurs virtually, predominantly using the online meeting platform called Zoom. The term “Zoombombing” used in this case refers to when people unexpectedly join an online meeting with the intention of hijacking the program to disrupt or to cause harm.

Case

One of the department’s programs is a student-led discussion series that promotes intercultural sharing and learning. Each month, a different group of students selects a cultural or global topic, issue, or current event to share and discuss. The program is student-led, and the majority of participants tend to be students, but occasionally faculty and staff join as well.

CSIE cases are offered as professional development for readers and are not meant to focus on specific individuals or organizations. Names and other identifying details within the cases have been changed. In some instances, cases may have been amalgamated. Article reuse guidelines: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this discussion program occurs on Zoom, so student facilitators have the opportunity to practice their virtual presentation and facilitation skills. While there is one staff support member running the technological back end of the Zoom meeting (managing the participant list, monitoring the waiting room, and coordinating the breakout rooms), the student facilitators serve as the face of the program by managing the presentation slides, answering the chat box comments and questions, and leading the breakout room discussions.

One group chooses to discuss belonging on campus and how to overcome obstacles associated with adjusting to life as international students. The facilitators are international students that are heavily involved in student organizations and university activities. They also each hold underrepresented identities at the university. At the beginning of the discussion, the student facilitators introduce themselves by sharing their academic background along with a bit about their identities as international students and their personal connections to the topic. The purpose of the discussion is to identify common obstacles that students may face while seeking belonging on campus, to share strategies for overcoming these obstacles and developing confidence, and to build community amongst international and domestic students.

After the staff member welcomes the participants and passes the facilitation over to the students, a few additional people request to enter the Zoom meeting. As students often join the programs after class or might need a few extra minutes to access the Zoom meeting due to technological difficulties, it is common that participants continue to trickle into the program for the first ten minutes or so.

The staff member admits the additional participants from the waiting room into the meeting and then notices that many participants have the same name. It is not uncommon that students have difficulty with internet, audio, or video connection so join on multiple devices in order to still participate in the program. Additionally, sometimes someone shares an individualized registration link with friends or colleagues rather than having them register on their own, and consequently multiple people may show up with the same name in the meeting. The staff member is unsure as to why there are multiple people with the same name but chooses to give them the benefit of the doubt and to leave them in the meeting based on past program management experiences.

A student facilitator privately messages the staff member mentioning that it seems odd that there are so many people with the same name. At this point, the staff member suggests that they personally handle the waiting room and participant list so that the students can focus on their facilitation and discussion.

The student facilitators proceed with their presentation. Suddenly, a screen annotation appears on top of the presentation slides and blocks a portion of the content. The screen annotation includes offensive hate speech directed towards certain identities that are represented in both the participant and facilitator groups. It is clear in this moment that the student-led discussion program is actively being Zoombombed.

The staff member quickly clears all annotations from the screen, moves all of the individuals with duplicate names back into the waiting room, and locks the meeting so that no additional members can join. The staff member privately messages the facilitators to let them know that they are closely monitoring the situation and to see if they would like to proceed with the presentation or pause to talk about the Zoombombing incident.

Discussion Questions

As you consider this case, discuss:

- Put yourself in the shoes of the support staff member, a student facilitator, and a student participant at the moment in which you realize the program is being Zoombombed. How would you react and respond to the situation in this moment? Do any factors impact how you choose to respond, and if so, how?
- How might you as a program manager proactively prepare for a situation like this? What would you want a protocol to include?
- What role does identity play in this case study?
- If you held the identity that was actively being targeted by the offensive screen annotation, how would you want the support staff and/or student facilitators to handle the situation? Also, how would you **not** want them to handle the situation?
- Imagine you are managing, leading, or attending a virtual program. What is an example of a topic or situation that would make you feel uncomfortable to the point of it crossing a line? As a challenge, draft a chat box comment that you feel like you would need to address and practice how you would address it with a partner.

Rethinking International Student Support: Utilizing an FYE Course to Scaffold International Students' Adjustment into U.S. Academic Culture

Michelle Huang

Ph.D. Student, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

Email: huan2312@umn.edu

Christopher Johnstone

Associate Professor, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

Email: john4810@umn.edu

Tags

International Student and Scholar Services; Program Design; Student Learning and Development; University/ Higher Education

Setting

The setting of this case is a large research university located in the Midwestern United States. The University has a student enrollment of over 45,000, and an international enrollment of 3,500. Each fall, the University welcomes around 1,000 new international students; and approximately 300 of the 1,000 incoming students are undergraduates (including both first-year and transfer students).

Case

In an effort to enrich the experience of its international students, the University's International Student Office offers various cultural programming events and workshops for students throughout the year. However, participation from the university's first-year international undergraduate students had been considerably lower

compared to international graduate students, especially for learning-focused events and workshops, such as preventing plagiarism.

Although all new international students are required to attend orientation sessions that cover administrative issues such as visas and campus transition topics, sessions were often too short and too early in the students' campus experience to know the extent to which the sessions were effective.

In order to scaffold international students' learning and understanding of the American college and classroom culture in a more sustained way than orientation sessions alone, the university introduced a first-year experience (FYE) course for new international undergraduate students in fall 2020.

The course, entitled *Introduction to U.S. College Culture*, is a one-credit, eight-week course designed to provide targeted learning opportunities and support to first-year international undergraduate students and to prepare them for a successful transition into studying at the postsecondary level in the U.S.

The focus of the course is to introduce key aspects of the U.S. academic culture to first-year international undergraduate students that may not be communicated to students elsewhere. The course is designed to help students to set reasonable expectations for their upcoming experience and increase their understanding of the key elements and norms of the U.S. college and classroom. Course designers believe that such knowledge will create a foundation for students to become successful in a U.S. university.

The course was created as a 100% online course with blended asynchronous and synchronous modules. The key topics covered in the course include:

- Module 1: Academic Standings and Expectations; High Impact Activities, Key Categories of Student Success and Corresponding University Resources
- Module 2: Effective Communications in Academic Settings (Class Speaking and Participation Strategies; Communicating with Professors and Other Professionals; Writing Professional Emails)
- Module 3: Time Management Strategies
- Module 4: Presentation Strategies
- Module 5: Academic Integrity and Preventing Plagiarism; Research Basics and Utilizing Library Resources to Conduct Research
- Module 6: Understanding U.S. Cultural Norms from a Cross-Cultural Perspective
- Module 7: Goal Setting Strategies; Career and Professional Development
- Module 8: Vocabulary Building Strategies; Final Progress Review and Self-Reflections

The homework assignments and activities in the course were designed to facilitate students' practice of the strategies and learning in the corresponding modules. Sample assignments included a formal email, weekly schedule, reflection journal, goal-setting worksheet, vocabulary log, etc.

There were a total of 68 first-year international undergraduate students who completed the course. From the course evaluation results, students highly praised the effectiveness of the course content including overall course quality, assignments and activities, course organization, quality of instruction. The mean of course satisfaction rating was 4.7, and the group median was 4.8 (based on a rating scale of 0-5; 5 represents "extremely high"), reflecting that students appreciated the content and delivery of the course.

Students indicated in the evaluation survey that an important outcome of the class is that they became more familiar with different aspects of U.S. college and academic culture, and they felt more confident and prepared

to study at the University. According to student feedback, the most useful modules were 1) Effective Communications in Academic Settings (especially Writing Professional Emails), 2) Time Management Strategies, and 3) Understanding U.S. Cultural Norms from a Cross-Cultural Perspective.

Discussion Questions

As you consider this case, discuss:

- Should this course be mandatory or optional? What are the considerations?
- What forms of support could be used to scaffold first-year international students' transition and adjustment to studying in a U.S. higher education institute?
- Based on the modules that students found most useful, what could you conclude about this institution and the international students' experiences within it?
- What types of scaffolding or information sharing do you think are most useful for supporting international students' experiences with unfamiliar higher education practices and cultures?
- What issues or factors not discussed in this case may influence international students' experiences at U.S. campuses?
- If you were to design a first-year experience course for international students, what topics would you include?

Protection vs. Independence: Staff Dilemmas in Effort to Foster Student Safety

Alyssa Nota, PhD

USA

Email: alyssa.nota@gmail.com

Tags

Crisis-Management; Cross-Cultural Issues; Education Abroad; Leadership and Strategy; Management and Operations; Personnel Management; Program Design; Student Services; University/Higher Education

Setting

SAO is a small study abroad organization managing 20 academic programs across several countries. It is a U.S.-based organization collaborating with numerous colleges and universities across the U.S. The program locations include a variety of large capital cities and mid-size cities in Europe, Asia and Latin America. A main focus of the organization is to provide cultural immersion, encouraging students to interact with locals and the local culture in safe, thoughtful, and meaningful ways.

This case focuses on a program based in a large northern European city. The program staff (all locals of the city) is preparing for the arrival of a group of 40 U.S. undergraduate students, all between ages of 18-21, most under the legal drinking age in their U.S. home states. In the country where they will be studying for one or two semesters, the legal drinking age is 18 years, and light consumption of beer or wine is culturally common with evening meals, however, cases of overconsumption/purposely getting inebriated are very rare and frowned upon in the culture. These cultural points and expectations, along with the organization's code of conduct expectations, and consequences for breaking the code of conduct, are discussed in predeparture advising and during orientation when students arrive to the country.

Case

The SAO group of students arrives on a Saturday afternoon to their host city. They are met at the airport by program staff and escorted to a local hotel where they will spend one night before moving into their homestays or residence hall. The hotel is located in a busy, central neighborhood, allowing students to begin to acclimate to the city. The program staff takes the students on a short walking tour and to a group dinner together (where no alcohol is served). After dinner students are encouraged to return to the hotel, but about one-quarter of the students opt to continue exploring the city on their own. Within a 10-minute walking radius of the hotel, there are at least three bars where alcohol is served. Two of the three tend to attract mostly locals, while one markets primarily to international customers and tourists at nearby hotels, including international students.

In previous semesters, SAO students have reported tactics used by bars in the program city, including the international-focused one, to attract them as regular customers, including contacting them on social media before and after arrival, offering student discounts, and offering benefits to students if they recruit others as paying customers. In addition, over the course of several semesters, at least four female students have noted problems occurring at the bar, including having their personal belongings (money, phone) stolen and receiving unwanted aggressive attention from patrons and staff members of the bar. While multiple students reported incidents to the program staff, the students did not file a police report. Moreover, at least two students reported being assaulted at the establishment; however, neither student chose to file a police report. Two students consulted with the SAO staff in order to meet with a local mental health counselor.

The program staff was increasingly concerned about the safety of students. In a regularly scheduled student meeting (not specific to these incidents), the program staff discussed safety and wellness tips with the group. They discussed the risks of alcohol and drug use and pointed out some examples of student injuries and incidents from previous years. During the meeting, one staff member mentioned the name of the international bar as 'a place where students had gone in the past and where some had encountered problems such as lost possessions or physical incidents, and the potential dangers of overconsumption of alcohol.'

Within two weeks of the meeting, the program staff received an attorney's letter noting their use of the bar's name and threatening legal action for defamation. (It was later determined that a student on the program had brought this information to the attention of the bar and that the student was being compensated for undocumented work at the establishment.) The staff consulted their own legal counsel who suggested that SAO resolve the case by offering a minor settlement payment to the bar. Without police reports from the past students accusing assault or theft, there was no legal action that the organization could take against the bar, even if students admitted verbally that the incidents had taken place. The staff was frustrated and continued to warn students in future groups about potential risks and actions of this kind in various similar establishments around the city and country, without using their names.

Discussion Questions

As you consider this case, discuss:

- How do the staff member's actions (warnings to students) reflect the organization's goal of encouraging 'safe, thoughtful and meaningful immersion'?
- Was it appropriate for staff to name the bar when warning students? Why or why not?
- What learning opportunities (for the staff members, students, and organization) do you see resulting from this experience?

- Would you suggest the staff and organization address/approach the issue of alcohol consumption and potential risks in the community/culture in a different way? How can the staff act to protect students from possible future problems of this nature?
- Is it a program's responsibility or role to guide or monitor students' behavior in students' free time or if they are not breaking local laws or cultural norms?
- Why do you think alcohol access and consumption remain a common issue with U.S. university students abroad? How can this issue be adequately addressed before and during the study abroad experience?

I'm Nonbinary and I use They/Them Pronouns: Creating an Inclusive Learning Environment

Lisa Johnson

Assistant Dean for International Study, Smith College, Northampton, Massachusetts, USA

Email: ldjohnson@smith.edu

Tags

Cross-Cultural Issues; Education Abroad; Ethics, Equity, and Social Justice; Partnerships; Personnel Management; Student Services; University/Higher Education

Setting

At College USA, a private, single-gendered, liberal arts college efforts are made to make diverse students feel welcome and supported. These efforts are generally emulated across campus including the education abroad office. In the education abroad office these efforts include, but are not limited to, “identity” resources on the education abroad website, offering a peer-to-peer mentoring program between returned and prospective education abroad students, and making sure that diverse students’ stories are included throughout all facets of the education abroad experience, especially during the pre-departure orientation and conversations. Due to staffing shortages in the education abroad office, the focus is primarily on students pursuing semester education abroad opportunities; minimal support is made available to students pursuing summer education abroad.

Program Provider ABC offers popular semester and summer field-based programs in an English-speaking country in the southern hemisphere. The program was originally designed by faculty both in the U.S. and in the host country. Only recently has the program started to recognize the importance of learning about and trying to follow best practices within the field of education abroad. At the moment, there is no information on ABC’s website providing resources for diverse students.

After a student had completed one of ABC’s summer programs, they wrote to the College USA education abroad office to report the following.

Case

CSIE cases are offered as professional development for readers and are not meant to focus on specific individuals or organizations. Names and other identifying details within the cases have been changed. In some instances, cases may have been amalgamated. Article reuse guidelines: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Dylan identifies as nonbinary and uses they/them pronouns, which they notified Program Provider ABC of before their departure. During the 6-week summer program, Dylan reported that the instructors rarely used the correct pronouns when referring to them. Additionally, Dylan reported that the most inappropriate incident took place with the person who was cooking for the program (who was also the mother of the onsite program director). This person approached Dylan one morning and told them that their identity was "anti-Christian" and that if they were staying for the semester, the students at the host university would have a hard time with their pronouns. Obviously upset by the statements, Dylan reported the incident to the ABC program staff. ABC's TA was supportive and kind, but the rest of the instructors never apologized or even checked in with Dylan about the incident. Dylan repeatedly requested to have a conversation with the instructors, which they pushed off until the program had ended. On Dylan's last day in the country, they had a Skype meeting with the U.S.-based program director, one of the instructors, and the TA. Dylan reported that the meeting was not very satisfying - the instructor continued to misgender Dylan and was ultimately asked to leave the meeting. No other instructors were present for the meeting and it was unclear to Dylan what steps, if any, ABC planned to take to address these issues for future students. As a result, Dylan continued to be frustrated that the instructors were unequipped to welcome and keep transgender students safe in their program and provide an inclusive and effective learning environment.

Upon receiving the report from Dylan, College USA's education abroad assistant director contacted ABC's U.S.-based program director to get more information as they were concerned that ABC wasn't providing adequate support for diverse students. ABC's U.S.-based program director apologized profusely and agreed that the onsite staff did an unacceptable job misgendering Dylan and not providing an effective learning environment for them. The director mentioned that up until now the program had only had transgender students who identified as male/female, so they had felt over confident in their ability and preparation to support their first non-binary student on the program.

Discussion Questions

As you consider this case, discuss:

- What are the identity intersections that are coming into play with this case study? What are ways to balance expectations around identity and identity expression from Dylan's home country with those of the host country?
- What are ways that education abroad professionals can help students mitigate the phenomena of experiencing microaggressions/macroaggressions? In what ways can home universities collaborate with education abroad partners onsite to raise awareness of the diversity of U.S. students in order to be prepared to support them?
- What are ways that program providers can help maximize effective learning environments for diverse on their programs? What might you recommend to Program Provider ABC as next steps?
- Many U.S. campuses are engaging with non-gender normative students to identify safer spaces. Discuss if this is something that education abroad programs/host institutions should also be providing to education abroad students.
- As an education abroad administrator (at the home institution or as the program provider) how would you help Dylan navigate this situation in the moment? What would you have done differently prior to departure?

- Using a post-structuralism approach (assuming that diverse students face structural and cultural barriers that impede their success thus placing the onus on institutions to change campus structures and practices rather than simply blaming the student for their inability to succeed¹), what needs to be deconstructed (i.e., who has benefited from the current model and/or are there structures that limit opportunities for certain populations) and reconstructed to best support non-binary identifying students?

¹ Quaye, S. J., & Harper, S. R. (Eds.). *Student Engagement in Higher Education: Theoretical Perspectives and Practical Approaches for Diverse Populations* (2nd ed.), 2014. Routledge.

CSIE cases are offered as professional development for readers and are not meant to focus on specific individuals or organizations. Names and other identifying details within the cases have been changed. In some instances, cases may have been amalgamated. Article reuse guidelines: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Navigating Cross-Currents: Establishing a Crisis Management Protocol

Thomas V. Millington

Executive Director, Abroadia, Geneva, NY, USA

Email: tom@abroadia.com

Tags

Crisis-Management; Cross-Cultural Issues; Education Abroad; Education Policy; Leadership and Strategy; University/Higher Education

Setting

Like many education-abroad host countries, Cuba presents unique and sometimes obfuscatory challenges to resident directors and central office staff located in the U.S. Yet, it is Cuba's unique situation-having survived a 60-year-old embargo and maintaining its pride in its defiance-that is attractive to many U.S. students. For some people, Cuba's telecommunication lethargy such as weak Internet connections and inefficient cell phone infrastructure, its laissez-fair approach to life and the lack of U.S. commercial interests make Cuba an ideal location for education abroad programming that seeks to provide students with a truly immersive experience. Cuba's political and technological situation requires that resident directors will often have to develop protocols and policies and modify them frequently.

The case study below centers on six students, four males and two females, from five U.S. states studying abroad in Cuba through *Study and Explore*, a provider founded in 1980 who has designed programs in Europe, but recently decided to enter the "hot" Cuban market. Upon arrival in Cuba at the beginning of the semester, *Study and Explore's* resident director Michael provided students with an orientation and an introduction to Playa University, the Cuban university who only recently had begun accepting American students as study abroad participants. During the semester, the students often interacted with American students from another provider, *Estudios Caribeños*, a larger and more established program than *Study and Explore*. For the first three months of the program there were no incidents; it was only as the abroad experience approached its conclusion that an event occurred that exposed the frailties of communication, lack of process documentation, incomplete cross-cultural understanding and complexity of the Cuban legal system in a way that impacted everyone involved in making a study abroad program work.

CSIE cases are offered as professional development for readers and are not meant to focus on specific individuals or organizations. Names and other identifying details within the cases have been changed. In some instances, cases may have been amalgamated. Article reuse guidelines: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Case

Toward the end of the spring semester Michael visited his students and immediately noticed that something was wrong. After some prodding they explained that they had gone to the beach and had invited a Cuban male, Pablo, to join them. At the beach, one of the students, Mary, had become extremely intoxicated and was in the water with the Pablo. The other students said that it appeared that Pablo was having intercourse with her, but they could not be sure since their lower torsos were below the surface of the water. Mary had no recollection of the event. Once she and Pablo returned to shore the other students gathered around her and refused to let Pablo anywhere near her. He then left abruptly, and the students returned to their homestays. Upon learning of the situation, Michael took the student to the hospital. The medical staff at the hospital refused to examine Mary stating that since she said she had no recollection of the incident, this indicated that a criminal element might be involved, and that she must go to the police and report the assault before the doctors could examine her. Mary refused to go to the police and expressed her wish to take an emergency contraception pill. Upon leaving the hospital Mary began to become angry and lashed out at Michael, saying that she just wanted to go home and wanted no further action taken since the semester was almost over and she would be returning to the U.S. anyway.

The resident director approached the International Programs Office at the host university, Playa University. The university required that all incidents involving international students be reported to the International Programs Office. The staff at the office, Karla and Angela expressed mild concern and were unaware of what procedures to follow or who to consult. The host university did not have resources or personnel to assist victims of sexual assault. Michael contacted his colleague, Samantha, at *Estudios Caribeños*. When informed of the situation and the lack of access to an emergency contraception pill, Samantha suggested that Michael could create his own emergency contraception pill by watching a YouTube video which demonstrated how one could create a concoction equivalent to an emergency contraception pill by combining various medications.

Once Marcos Salazar, the dean of the university, learned of the assault he expressed full support to the resident director and the student and said that the university was prepared to act in support of her and to work with the police investigation.

Discussion Questions

As you consider this case, discuss:

- How could the pre-departure and on-site orientation be strengthened to better prepare students? Who should be involved?
- Who should create the on-site emergency protocols for sexual assault of study abroad students? The host university or the program provider?
- What kind of cross-cultural communications strategies should the resident director employ when discussing the incident with the host university international programs staff?
- Which laws and policies should guide the director's actions?
- How can the resident director best support the student?

- How should the resident director respond to the “medical advice” given to him by a colleague in the field? Should this conversation be shared with anyone?
- What observations can we make about the individuals and organizations involved in this case study?
- How can we better train international educators for this type of situation?

Disaster Distress:

Navigating an Earthquake in Japan

Elly Vogt

International Education Professional, Middlebury Institute of International Studies, Monterey, CA, USA
Email: ellydvogt@gmail.com

Tags

Crisis-Management; Education Abroad; Leadership and Strategy; Management and Operations; University/Higher Education

Setting

On March 11, 2011, an earthquake with the magnitude of 9.0 struck the north east coast of Japan. It was one of the largest earthquakes that had been recorded in global history which resulted in a devastating tsunami and accident at the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant ¹. University X, a private institution in the United States, had five students studying abroad at a partner university in Tokyo, as well as seven students bound to start their study abroad program in Tokyo that next week. The Education Abroad office at University X is composed of one Director and two coordinators.

Case

The Director of Education Abroad for University X, was tasked with making pivotal decisions immediately after the earthquake in Japan. Following University X's risk management protocols, the Director reached out to all of the students studying abroad in Japan to make sure they were safe. Fortunately, all of the students were accounted for. Although the aftershocks were over, there was growing concern from the students and parents about the nuclear plant accident. After researching recommendations from the United States Government, the Director discovered that the students were far enough from the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear plant that they were not in danger from radiation

¹ Nohara, M. (2011). Impact of the Great East Japan Earthquake and tsunami on health, medical care and public health systems in Iwate Prefecture, Japan, 2011. *Western Pacific Surveillance & Response Journal*, 2(4).

exposure. However, other possible safety risks following the earthquake, such as fires and power outages, influenced the Director to mandate that all students come home as soon as possible. Education Abroad Coordinators at University X worked with the students in order to get them on the next possible flight home and also spoke with parents about their concerns for their children's safety. University X assured students and parents that they would be refunded for any aspects of the program that were being cut short due to the earthquake. University X also worked closely with their partner university in Tokyo to make sure that the students were still able to complete their classes in an online format.

The United States issued a travel warning for Japan, which led the Director to cancel the upcoming program in Tokyo. There were seven students bound to start classes within the next week and two of whom were already in Japan traveling before the program started. University X apologized for the cancellation and promised to refund students for all program costs. Following recommendations by the United States travel advisory, the Director of University X sent out a letter to all students and parents affirming that the decision to cancel the program in Tokyo was in the best interest of the students' safety. As an alternative for these students, the Education Abroad office set up a partnership with a well-regarded institution in the United States that would enable this cohort of students to take Japanese classes there for the next semester. This would allow students the opportunity to experience a different educational setting and provide the desired Japanese classes. Although not all students chose this option, it provided a way for University X to offer an educational opportunity focused on Japanese language and culture.

Discussion Questions

As you consider this case, discuss:

- Debrief: What do you think the Director of the Education Abroad office did well in managing programs after the earthquake? What could they have done differently?
- What training and protocols should be in place for staff at all levels to prepare for emergencies? What preparation do you think the education abroad office can do to help students be prepared to handle natural disasters in countries that have a high level of risk?
- How should have University X evaluated when programs in Japan could resume? What considerations should University X and their partner university in Tokyo have kept in mind when resuming programs?
- Imagine the Director could not get a hold of a student in the disaster zone. What would have been the best next steps? How could they have worked to locate students?
- Who were the different stakeholders involved in this case? How did those relationships affect the crisis management process?
- How should the Education Abroad have supported students as they returned back to the United States? Are the practices different when the reason for evacuation is a natural disaster as opposed to other crises?

Distressed and Dehydrated: Stigmatization and International Student Mental Health

Hallie Bodey

Program Manager, Center for Global Law and Policy, Santa Clara, CA, USA

Email: hbodey@scu.edu

Tags

Crisis-Management; Cross-Cultural Issues; International Student and Scholar Services; Management and Operations; Non-Formal Education; Partnerships; Primary and Secondary Education

Setting

At a large, private U.S. University, each department operates as its own unit. The Office of Summer Programs (OSP) has 40 full-time employees responsible for non-degree secondary education programming. Programming is offered in the U.S. and abroad.

Each summer, OSP hosts International Academy, a two-week non-degree/not-for-credit conference at the U.S. campus. Approximately 80 Temporary Program Staff are hired to support the Academy. Academically talented high school aged international student group organizations attend and live in campus residences. Group organizations sign up in the fall for the following summer. Each organization sends at least one chaperone from the home country selected by the facilitating group organization. Students attend the program once, but group organizations tend to return annually. The student breakdown is approximately 35% Latin American countries through one group organization, 35% from mainland China through multiple group organizations, and the remaining students vary greatly in diversity, representing all continents, except Antarctica. Students take a variety of half-day workshops and are exposed to a wide range of academic resources on campus as part of this unique growth opportunity to explore all that university campuses have to offer. A secondary outcome of the program is developing intercultural communication skills.

While some participating group organizations are high schools, others like ChinaCAMPER are for-profit organizations that do not have long lasting relationships with their students or chaperones.

CSIE cases are offered as professional development for readers and are not meant to focus on specific individuals or organizations. Names and other identifying details within the cases have been changed. In some instances, cases may have been amalgamated. Article reuse guidelines: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Case

Information presented in this case may be triggering for some readers. Content references self-harm.

Staff and students are provided with refillable water bottles for the duration of their stay on campus. At the nightly residence check-in meeting, Javier, a temporary Head Counselor, reminds his students and chaperones to drink extra water due to the hot weather. Xu, a student from China traveling with ChinaCAMPER, lost her water bottle two days ago, and has not requested a replacement.

The next morning Xu complains to the ChinaCAMPER chaperone that she has a headache and wants some medicine. The chaperone tells Xu to get some food in the dining hall first. After breakfast, but before class, Xu complains to Javier that she has a headache and her chaperone would not give her medicine. Javier provides Xu with headache medicine from the first aid kit. Javier does not complete an incident report which is required any time the first aid kit is accessed.

At dinner, Xu tells the chaperone that she still has a headache. The chaperone asks Javier if they can go to the nurse. Javier accompanies Xu and the chaperone to the camp nurse. The camp nurse determines that Xu has signs of severe dehydration. Xu admits in the conversation that she lost her water bottle and has not been drinking water for “a few days.” The camp nurse recommends Xu be taken to the on-campus hospital for intravenous rehydration. Hospital trips require a higher-level temporary staff member. Javier calls the program’s 24/7 emergency number and temporary Residential Director, Amelia, answers.

Javier summarizes the situation to Amelia. Amelia asks Javier to write an incident report and drives a vehicle to the Nurse station to pick up Xu and the chaperone for the trip to the hospital. While driving, Amelia asks the chaperone to notify Xu’s emergency contact, Xu’s mother, that they are going to the hospital.

When inserting the needle, the hospital nurse notices that there are signs of “recent” self-harm on Xu and expresses concern about these in combination with Xu’s dehydration. Xu’s medical form provided to OSP by Xu’s mother does not have any information about a history of mental illness and instead states that she is in “perfect” health in each category. Given this information, Amelia asks Xu’s chaperone to contact Xu’s mother about the signs of self-harm. The chaperone states that she will keep an eye on Xu and does not think that it is necessary to bother the parent again. Amelia insists. Over speakerphone in front of Amelia and Xu, the chaperone calls Xu’s mother, who does not address the self-harm directly, but does not seem surprised, she states, “Next week, Xu goes to a new boarding school in Switzerland. She is not your problem next week. She is your job this week. Go to the hospital again if she needs more water. Please don’t call me again unless it is a real emergency.”

Discussion Questions

As you consider this case, discuss:

- There are multiple communication breakdowns or problems in this case. Identify each and determine how you might limit them for the next summer’s International Academy.
- What are Amelia’s next steps? What should be done by OSP between now and the program end date?
- What are the challenges for short-term non-degree seeking program staff when mental health concerns are raised? By contacting Xu’s mother, have OSP’s and ChinaCAMPER’s ethical and professional responsibilities to Xu been met? Is there anything else that can be done for Xu longer term?

- What additional training or orientation sessions might be useful for visiting chaperones and temporary program staff?
- How might updates to the student health form better communicate the usage and importance of sensitive medical information to different cultural audiences? What do program managers expect from an emergency contact? How might the expectations of an emergency contact be better communicated?
- What feedback should be given to ChinaCAMPER's full-time staff representatives?

CASE STUDIES IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

CSIEpub.org *An open-access online publication*

Authors Wanted for Fall 2021



Welcoming all scholar-practitioners, including working professionals, faculty, researchers, and graduate students

Tentative publication schedule for Volume 2, Issue 2:

Intent to submit due: September 24, 2021

Draft due: October 15, 2021

Collaborative peer review: October 18 - November 12, 2021

Final submission due: November 12, 2021

Publication date: December 3, 2021

See our website for more information

CSIEpub.org/authors