Making the Return Matter: An Exploration of Re-entry Support in American Jesuit Institutions in the Context of Internationalization

Author: Kaitlyn Victoria Solano

Persistent link: http://hdl.handle.net/2345/bc-ir:108814

This work is posted on eScholarship@BC,
Boston College University Libraries.

Boston College
Lynch School of Education

Department of Educational Leadership and Higher

Education Center for International Higher Education

Making the Return Matter:

An Exploration of Re-entry Support in American Jesuit Institutions in the Context of

Internationalization

Master's
Thesis By

Kaitlyn V. Solano

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in International Higher Education

April 10th, 2019

Abstract

Internationalization of higher education continues to transform the field of post-secondary education around the world. Student mobility, and specifically study abroad, operates as tool of internationalization that receives a lot of attention from institutions, nations, and students alike. Support for studying abroad is rooted in the many benefits, including but not limited: exposure to new cultures and perspectives, improvement of foreign language skills, development of independence and personal confidence, and expansion of problem solving skills. However, the transition back home after an experience abroad can often be a difficult experience for students who lack intentional and specific support through their institution. This re-entry period is often overlooked by institutions, however, it is a part of a student's study abroad experience and should be supported as such through resources and programming for returned students. American Jesuit institutions in particular promote participation in study abroad as it aligns with the Jesuit mission and values rooted in serving God through serving others. As institutions that place a high value on engaging with the world and a holistic view of the educational experience, American Jesuit institutions have an obligation to support students through re-entry. This study looks at how these institutions support students as they return from abroad, the major challenges they face, how they integrate Jesuit values into their support, and what can be done in the future.

Key words: study abroad, re-entry, return, Jesuit higher education, student mobility

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Making the Return Matter:

An Exploration of Re-entry Support in American Jesuit Institutions in the Context of

Internationalization

Introduction

Higher education, or the pursuit of higher learning, continues to be an internationalized and globalized effort since its inception centuries ago. The global aspects of and the internationalization efforts within institutions of higher education vary over time— growing and shrinking due to a variety of reasons, including but not limited to political climates, national and international policies, and availability of resources and international relationships. Today, institutions around the world are actively involved in the process of internationalization, and working towards improving these efforts. This process is a comprehensive effort, entangling practitioners from all corners of campus and involving offices across institutions. One aspect of internationalization quite common across institutions is the push to increase student mobility, especially that of outbound students, traveling to and studying in another country for a portion or the entirety of their degree. This experience for students, typically referred to as study abroad or study away, is a commonly celebrated and encouraged opportunity for students to explore the world, to expand their perspectives, and to prepare them to become truly "global citizens". However, how to support students returning from abroad and how to integrate these experiences is not as commonly understood or practiced. A travesty for the students and the institutions involved, study abroad without re-entry support diminishes the effectiveness of study abroad as a tool for internationalization.

The idea of internationalization in the context of higher education encompasses a wide range of departments and actors within a university, from specific offices on campus, to international collaborations between institutions, from teaching and learning within the classroom, to co-curriculars outside the classroom. In the early 1980s, when the discussion of internationalization of tertiary education began to take shape, internationalization was understood as "the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution" (de Wit, 1999, p.2). Today this phenomenon continues to grow and transform as institutions evolve, technology advances, and collaborations between countries and institutions expand. Most recently, Knight (2015) updated this definition:

> Internationalization includes the policies and practices undertaken by academic systems and institutions—and even individuals—to cope with the global academic environment. Internationalization at the national, sector, and institutional levels is defined as the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education. (p.2).

The scope of internationalization is broad, and encompasses efforts on the individual level as well as the national level, and each step in between. Its effect on higher education is extensive and each system it influences becomes a tool for an institution to further their own process of internationalization. Student mobility is just one of these systems. From the institutional perspective, student mobility, or the movement of students to pursue higher education in a nation other than their own, involves both inbound students— international students and scholars coming to the institution— as well as outbound students— students studying abroad. Outbound students leaving their institution to pursue a summer, semester, or yearlong experience studying

at another institution, are of particular interest to institutions as their experiences abroad often occur in the middle of their study at an institution, and allows students to bring benefits of their international experience back to their home institution.

Study abroad can take many forms— from a undergraduate semester away to pursuing an entire degree, undergraduate or graduate, in a different country. Study abroad includes all arrangements through which students complete a part of their degree experience, which includes additionally experiences such as internships and research undertaken in another country, as well as service learning trips. This practice is considered both a benefit of internationalization and an internationalization effort.

In the realm of higher education, the missions of Jesuit education and of study abroad share an interest in educating individuals about the world through exposure to new countries, cultures, languages, and perspectives, and share a goal in cultivating global citizens. The benefits of Jesuit higher education and the benefits of studying abroad are well researched and understood: Jesuit higher education's focus on formation, discernment, and social justice are considered beneficial for students, while study abroad experiences boast increased intercultural competence, increased foreign language skills, and development of independence. In fact, these benefits are often cited in order to promote participation in both Jesuit higher education and study abroad; however, there is not a similar breadth of knowledge or a clear understanding of how studying abroad at a Jesuit institution of higher education benefits students. The lack of research at this intersection is disappointing considering these two areas of higher education share goals and expectations for their participants and thousands of students participate in higher education at this intersection. More so than that, there is nothing examining how students at American Jesuit universities navigate their return to their home institutions after studying abroad,

and how (or even if) their Jesuit universities provide them with resources and support them after taking part in an international study experience, aligned with the Jesuit values. This period immediately following a study abroad experience is referred to as the re-entry or return period for students.

Since both the institutional goals of Jesuit universities and the inherent goals of studying abroad lend themselves to continued learning and allowing students an experience to enhance their university experience and learning, there is a need to ensure students are supported throughout this experience and this learning. As such, this study seeks to learn to what extent and in what ways American Jesuit universities support students in the re-entry process associated with returning from abroad.

In order to understand how institutions currently support students at Jesuit universities across the United States, this study looks at what is happening in study abroad focused offices at these institutions, examining what resources currently exist, what challenges exist, and how the Jesuit mission manifests in these experiences. The findings suggests the current resources are slim but growing, and challenges are numerous. Specifically, this study is interested in addressing four main questions:

1. What programs or resources exist for students returning from abroad at Jesuit American institutions?

2. What challenges do offices face in providing more (or better) programs and resources for students when they return from abroad?

3. Are there any plans to increase (or enhance) resources for students returning from abroad in these offices?

4. When institutions consider re-entry programming-- what is currently being done or in regards to future plans— are there any particular connections between those efforts and the Jesuit ideals for education that guide these institution? In what ways?

The responses to these four questions offer a detailed look at the state of re-entry at each institution, and allow for a comparison of the state of re-entry across institutions. By exploring the current state of re-entry across American Jesuit institutions, trends across successes and failures can be assessed and general standards of practice can be created. These trends and models of success can inform other Jesuit American institutions, as well as open up the conversation surrounding re-entry to all higher education institutions across the United States and around the globe.

Literature Review

While this study focuses narrowly on the status of re-entry at American Jesuit institutions, the importance of supporting re-entry and, generally, student mobility, are best understood through the broader lens of internationalization and the current goals and purpose of higher education. While institutions of all kinds of makeups— whether secular or religiously affiliated, whether of high prestige or lesser— concern themselves with internationalization and use, or attempt to use study abroad programs, as a tool of internationalization, Jesuit Catholic institutions offer a unique perspective on re-entry. The efforts of Catholic universities, and specifically Jesuit Catholic institutions, offer an example of a network of institutions- global in nature, engaged in international work- who are a part of the effort to engage in internationalization in order to pursue their intrinsic goals of bettering the world for the sake of humanity.

The Purpose of Higher Education & the Global Citizen

The pursuit of learning, either formal or informal, has been around as long as society itself. Centuries prior to the formal higher education institutions established in the Middle Ages, and a millennia before the establishment of the modern university during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, scholars traveled near and far to pursue education in the hopes of expanding their knowledge of the world and of humanity (de Wit and Merkx, 2012, p.43-44). These academic pilgrimages, while vastly different from today's understanding of student mobility, illustrate, in part, that the pursuit of knowledge has known no boundaries, whether the national borders of today or the perimeters of kingdoms and communities of past. These pursuits, done in earnest to expand learning through exposure to new ideas, perspectives, and views, demonstrate the underlying goal of higher education— to educate individuals.

This basic mission of higher education continues to guide institutions today, however the interpretation of this goal and the details of how to educate and to educate for what purpose evolve with respect to those in power of the institutions. With the establishment of more formal institutions, and the concurrent formation of national borders, the mission of post-secondary education turned to educating students to be citizens, and the university served the nation state (Zelizer, 2011). While the institution remained a place to pursue knowledge and to seek exposure to different ways of thinking, its greater purpose turned to educating citizens to better the society and the state it served. Within the last century, the interests of both the state and society have transformed due to the effects of globalization. Today, more than ever before, students cannot merely be educated as citizens of their own nation, but rather must be educated to be citizens of the world at large, to be global citizens.

While pilgrimages of scholars in ancient times, or of scholars within the first half of this millennia, may not be considered truly efforts of internationalization due to the vastly different political understanding of nations at the time, they demonstrate an early iteration of the global citizen before the borders that created national citizens. Early scholars pursued what institutions of higher education strive for today— educated citizens who develop an understanding and appreciation for different perspectives and new ways of thinking.

Global Citizens and Student Mobility

There are many aspects of internationalization that can facilitate a student's learning towards a global outlook, with an understanding of different perspectives and novel manners of thought, such as internationalization of the curriculum, increasing the number of international students in the classroom, and supporting faculty and staff mobility. However, "there is simply no substitute for spending time in another country, immersed in another culture...very few experiences in life provide greater insight into the strengths and limitations of one's own culture and values; very few experiences teach us more about how to understand others" than studying abroad (Levin, 2013, p.56). These opportunities allow students to learn through firsthand experience, bringing to light aspects of the world indescribable from a far and unfathomable from one's own home. In fact, mobility of students and scholars predates the existence of formalized institutions of higher education. Unfortunately, as the number of institutions grew, the need for students to travel for education lessened, creating a natural decline in the number of students studying "abroad" or, more aptly, traveling for education (de Wit & Merkx, 2012). As nations began to form and national boundaries solidified, the idea of studying abroad sometimes appeared less attractive since the prospect of sending top scholars to foreign institutions sounded

like a losing proposition to nations. However, the wealth of knowledge and enjoyment gained

through an abroad experience allowed the activity to remain an "important element of university

life" (de Wit & Merkx, 2012).

Nevertheless, studying abroad is not synonymous with internationalization. In fact,

providing a study abroad opportunity or substantial study away programme does not always lead

to increased internationalization for an institution (de Wit, 2011). Rather study abroad is "an

instrument for promoting internationalization" and the success of this instrument depends on the

institution and the effort in place to fully integrate this process into the institution (de Wit, 2011).

Oftentimes study abroad is supported predominantly from the sending side of the exchange.

Students receive the most communication and outreach from their institution prior to their travel

(Vande Berg et al., 2012).

Study Abroad: A U.S. Perspective

In the context of universities in the United States, study abroad programs encompass a

wide range of experiences, through a variety of domestic institutional collaborations and

consortiums, third party providers, and direct exchanges with foreign institutions. Most

American universities offer at least one of the opportunities, and oftentimes a combination of

these and other methods, to their students. During the 2016 - 2017 academic year, 332,727

students studied abroad for academic credit from American universities (Institute for

International Education). This number represents only roughly 2 percent of all undergraduate

students studying in American universities in that academic year. However, when considering

the percent of students who study abroad during their degree program, that percentage jumps to

16 percent of students pursuing a bachelor's degree (Institute for International Education,

2018a). The Open Doors Report contends this percentage continues to rise year after year, as more students are participating in both higher education as well as study abroad (Institute for International Education, 2018a).

While the actual number of students studying abroad is quite low, the United States demonstrates fervent support for sending students abroad through various strategic plans and through funding abroad opportunities for students. The United States Department of Education, the State Department, universities around the country, and third party study abroad providers, are among the network of organizations pushing to grow American participation in study abroad. In their first articulated international strategy plan, the United States Department of Education outlined their first objective to "increase the global competencies of all U.S. students" (United States Department of Education, 2012). Defining global competency as, "those who use their knowledge and skills to investigate the world beyond their immediate environment, recognize their own and others' perspectives, communicate their ideas effectively with diverse audiences, and translate their ideas into appropriate actions", the Department of Education points out the opportunity to study abroad as one of the main ways to enhance students' global competencies (United States Department of Education, 2012). To support students in pursuing study abroad opportunities the State Department offers a range of scholarships and programs for undergraduate students, as well as post graduate experiences such as the Fulbright program (United States State Department 2011). In addition to enhancing global competency, the Department of Education finds study abroad contributes to "a comprehensive liberal arts education" by helping students develop, "critical thinking skills; (the) ability to communicate in more than one language; (the) ability to communicate across cultural and national boundaries; and the ability to make informed judgments on major personal and social issues based on the

analysis of various perspectives" (United States State Department 2011). With this support from the government, combined with the abundance of opportunities afforded students at higher education institutions, articulated support for study abroad is strong in the United States.

Re-entry and the Return

While the positive influences of study abroad are widely studied and advertised in the context of higher education, the research on what happens after is much less developed. While studying abroad through universities in the United States dates back to the 1920s, most of the resources on re-entry in the United States only appeared in the 21st century. Some discussion of the challenge of the return dates back a few decades earlier, but there is a clear lag between the research enumerating the benefits to be reaped from study abroad, and the research discussing how students can benefit from their experiences once home and how students can integrate their experience upon returning.

The most prominent body of literature in the realm of re-entry focuses on confirming the phenomena of "culture shock" and "reverse culture shock"— when students leave from and return to their homes and home institutions. Discussion of culture shock first began in the field of anthropology, coined in the 1950s to describe the discomfort and adjustment anthropologists faced when studying new cultures (Hoyt, 1961). More recently, reverse culture shock or re-entry shock has entered the conversation. First coined by expatriates returning to the United States, "reverse culture shock" often refers to the unexpected feelings of discomfort and difficulty adjusting one encounters upon returning to one's home country after a period of time abroad (Clarke, 2016).

Both terms refer to the difficulty one faces in adjusting to a culture after being acclimated to a different culture and are prevalent experiences in study abroad programs as students face the possibility of experiencing both feelings due to the nature of study abroad programs. In the literature surrounding study abroad experiences of students, only recently has data been collected surrounding students' experience of this difficulty upon their return. Initial research in this area looked at the experiences of students that had come to the United States for study and then returned to their home countries. Altbach (1991), for example, looked at how students felt upon returning to their host institution, and specifically considered their choice to stay in their home country or to eventually return to the United States, not necessarily how students felt reintegrating into their home culture. Other studies emerged from universities that interviewed and surveyed students to learn more about their experiences returning to their home institution. Many found that students encountered difficulties in returning (Brubaker, 2017; Kartoshkina, 2015; Marx & Moss, 2015; Presbitero, 2016; Young, 2014). However, just labeling this experience does not capture the range of experiences students encounter upon their return to their home institution.

Gay & Savicki (2015) explore re-entry more specifically by surveying 81 students from one United States university about their experience returning from abroad. This survey looked at different factors that students encountered while reintegrating into their university and found feelings of loss, disconnectedness, and uncertainty to be common among the respondents. However, the researchers called for more extensive and interpersonal data collection to further explore these results. Similarly, Wielkiewicz & Turkowski (2010) collected data from 669 undergraduates at two different United States institutions via survey. Their study focused mainly on interpersonal relationships and the effect of going abroad on those relationships. The study

revealed the same post-study abroad feelings of loss and disconnectedness that Gay & Savicki (2015) found. In general, these studies call for more data collection and demonstrate a common experience of students finding difficulty upon returning home.

In response to the lack of case studies surrounding this topic, Garboti & Rothschild (2016) added to the body of research with ethnographies discussing their own experiences in their Collaborative Autoethnography (CEA project). Their CEA project looked at their own experiences during and after studying abroad, discussing both short term and long term perspectives. They discuss in detail their return and the effects their abroad experience has on their post abroad lives. The CEA project touches on both the benefits they experienced, such as foreign language attainment, and the difficulties they faced, such as feelings of emotional distress. However, this project only explores the experiences of two individuals and while their data aids in the understanding of re-entry, there is more to investigate in the realm of re-entry.

Kartoshkina (2015) discusses the "bittersweet" experiences of students upon re-entry. Using both surveys and interviews Kartoshkina identifies three major areas where students shared similar feelings. The first relates to difficulties in experiencing both feelings of excitement to return home with feelings of loss associated with leaving their host institution and friends. The second has to do with difficulty communicating with friends and family about their time abroad and the third area of shared experience relates to acquiring new critical perspective on the United States. This study delves more deeply into the lives of students upon their return and identifying these common experiences gives three distinct areas to investigate more deeply.

In *Maximizing Study Abroad: A Student's Guide to Strategies for Language and Culture Learning and Use* (2002) the re-entry section focuses entirely on the difficulties students will encounter upon returning to their home (Paige et. al, 2002). The section acknowledges students

may face these challenges at different times, and they may arise in different social settings, mirroring the areas of difficulty discussed in Kartoshkina's (2015) research. The book draws on the experiences of students who participated in an abroad program at the University of Minnesota and the advice in the book is developed in collaboration with these students. The advice given by the students demonstrates shared experiences and needs. However, the authors fail to identify these experiences in detail, again demonstrating the need for further investigation into this subject.

In terms of best practices, *Maximizing Study Abroad* offers a series of activities for students to do with one another upon their return, but with very little context on the purpose of the activities or their goals (2002). While the list of proposed activities provides institutions with a place to begin developing their re-entry resources, its lack of direction and purpose creates an incomplete resource for schools. NAFSA, the Association of International Educators, also offers some resources in terms of re-entry, however most of their publications focus on pre-departure and preparing students, with their re-entry resources paling in comparison (NAFSA: Re-Entry, 2018). Nevertheless, practitioners acknowledge the need for and importance of re-entry resources and programming for students. The lack of resources may be indicative of the lag in research and understanding of the experience itself.

At the 2008 NAFSA National Conference, a network of study abroad professionals presented, "Providing Post-Study Abroad Support - It's Easier Than You Think!" in order to "recognize the importance and the need for providing reentry support, to provide examples of how to holistically address students' reentry needs, (and) to identify opportunities to collaborate with offices and individuals". The presentation included survey data from returned study abroad students, where over 80 percent of students faced difficulty in returning from abroad (Chappell et

al., 2008). The survey also looked at the kinds of re-entry programming provided as well as the

kinds of programming students want. The former overwhelmingly consisting of opportunities to

work at study abroad affairs, and pizza parties; the latter a more diverse list of resources

including a re-entry course in some capacity, one on one exit surveys with the study abroad

office, alumni connections, and readings lists (Chappell et al., 2008). From the survey data, the

presenters concluded re-entry support must include psycho-emotional support, academic

reintegration, and social engagement for students to have a smoother re-entry experience

(Chappell et al., 2008). With an understanding of what kinds of engagement students are looking

for, schools have a better idea of how to support students. However, there is no information on

whether these findings are being used by schools to support their students.

Global Mission and Outlook of Jesuit Catholic Higher Education

Jesuit higher education in the United States and around the world is run and maintained

by members of the Society of Jesus, a religious order in the Catholic faith founded by Saint

Ignatius of Loyola. Catholicism maintains a long tradition of supporting education through

schools and the education of teachers. While the focus and mission of Catholic schools develop

from a Christian perspective, the goals of these universities are like the goals of any other

institutions— to educate their students to be citizens and to serve society (John Paul II, 1990).

These institutions are not untouched by globalization and face the challenge of incorporating

global and international dimensions into their institutions. What makes Catholic institutions

distinct in this effort is their Christian identity, and the manner in which institutions can

incorporate internationalization efforts alongside and in partnership with their fundamental

ideals. Catholic education, according to Newman (1852), is meant to serve the world:

> For why do we educate, except to prepare for the world? Why do we cultivate the
>
> intellect of the many beyond the first elements of knowledge, except for this world? Will
>
> it be much matter in the world to come whether our bodily health or whether our
>
> intellectual strength was more or less, except of course as this world is in all its
>
> circumstances a trial for the next? If then a University is a direct preparation for this
>
> world, let it be what it professes.

In the work of educating for the world, Catholic education naturally supports a global and

international outlook on education. Over a hundred years after Newman's plea for education for

the sake of the world, Pope John Paul II (1990) reiterated this distinct mission of Catholic

education in his Apostolistic constitution on Catholic universities:

> Its purpose is that the Christian mind may achieve, as it were, a public, persistent and
>
> universal presence in the whole enterprise of advancing higher culture and that the
>
> students of these institutions become people outstanding in learning, ready to shoulder
>
> society's heavier burdens and to witness the faith to the world.

In this address to Catholic institutions around the globe, the international basis of this call to duty

reiterates the global outlook of Catholic institutions of education.

Pope John Paul II continues, "in order better to confront the complex problems facing

modern society, and in order to strengthen the Catholic identity of the Institutions, regional,

national and international cooperation is to be promoted in research, teaching, and other

university activities among all Catholic Universities" (John Paul II, 1990, No.7). Catholic

identity, the ability of Catholic institutions to best serve the world, will only be strengthened

through collaborations with one another, domestically and abroad. This suggests that not only is

the Catholic mission of institutions global in nature, but also an effective manner to progress and to achieve the goals of the institutions is to collaborate with international neighbors.

Within the broader community of Catholicism, this international call speaks to the Jesuits and their mission of education deeply. Members of the Society of Jesus are known as Jesuits and are best known for their educational institutions in the lay world, however their influence reaches beyond the classrooms and campuses they maintain (What We Do, 2017). Fittingly, the order itself began in a higher education institution. Saint Ignatius of Loyola, along with six of his peers, formed the Roman Catholic order while studying at the University of Paris in the 1530s (What We Do, 2017). From here, these first Jesuits committed themselves to serving their community through preaching, leading spiritual exercises, and teaching (Boston College, 2014). It was not until a few years later that the Jesuits formally took up the practice of maintaining schools, with a college in Messina, Italy, and from there they saw great success in education (Boston College, 2014). By the time Saint Ignatius died in 1556, the Jesuits maintained 35 tertiary institutions across Europe and that number continued to grow with 168 institutions of higher education across the world today (Nguyen et al., 2018). At its roots, Jesuit higher education is an international endeavor, with institutions, both academic as well as religious, around the world. The order maintains its own leadership structure, overseeing its members around the world as well as continental outposts to maintain strong regional relationships (International Association of Jesuit Universities, 2017). The order crosses national borders to bring education, and Catholicism, to marginalized communities.

The success of the Jesuits within the realm of higher education can be attributed to many factors, ranging from the need in the community (Boston College, 2014; What We Do, 2017) to their innovative university system (Boston College, 2014). Today, the Society of Jesus

maintains almost 200 institutions of higher education in countries around the world. Jesuits institutions support almost a quarter of all tertiary students enrolled in Catholic higher education institutions (Nguyen, 2018). Their influence stretches into the K-12 realm, as well, with over 300 primary and secondary institutions around the world (IAJU, 2017; Boston College, 2014). The first American Jesuit institution arrived in the United States in 1791 and currently there are 28 Jesuit higher education institutions in the states (Nguyen et al, 2018). These institutions vary in size, location, cost, traditions, and student makeup. The full list of the 28 Jesuit institutions of higher education currently in operation in the United States can be found in Appendix A.

The distinguishing features of Jesuit education are the distinctly Jesuit mission, and the Ignatian values that guide these institutions. This mission is, "to work for reconciliation every day — with God, with human beings and with the environment" (What We Do, 2017). In their work within education, this mission takes shape through cura personalis, or educating the whole person, and through being men and women for and with others by focusing on service and social justice. This education supports a global and international curriculum through the Jesuit idea of seeing God in all things, through all people, bringing justice to a global society.

These ideals, borrowed from the order's beginnings and renegotiated over time, focus on "consciously developing students" encouraging them to "be attentive, be reflective, be loving" throughout their educations and throughout their lives (Boston College, 2014). The call to be attentive encourages students to pay attention to their experiences and their world, to learn from the people, places, and events around them, and to be mindful. The focus on being reflective asks students to "compose meaning" from what they observe through attentiveness (Boston College, 2014). Reflection allows students to understand where they stand in the world, and gives students the space to process what they are experiencing and how they can learn from it.

The attention to be loving shows students how they can act in the world and serve others around them, locally and globally. Jesuit universities are, by tradition and by choice, institutions in which these educational ideals take the shape of a liberal arts education encompassing professional competence and societal responsibility as well (Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities, 2017).

There are both international and national organizations that serve as guidance for Jesuit higher education institutions, offering resources for defining missions that incorporate these ideals as well as collaboration opportunities with other institutions. At the international level, the International Association of Jesuit Universities (IAJU) provides collaboration, depth, and discernment for their members (IAJU, 2017b). Their members, Jesuit higher education institutions from all over the world, belong to a global network committed to educating students in the same traditions as Saint Ignatius, over 500 years later. In addition to this global network, regional organizations exist in all corners of the globe. At the national level, in the context of the United States there is the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities (AJCU). AJCU serves as a supportive "national organization that represents Jesuit higher education among its various constituencies; provides a forum for the exchange of information and experiences in Jesuit higher education; and encourages and facilitates collaborative initiatives among its member institutions" (Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities, 2017). Specifically the AJCU provides resources for members in regard to defining institutional goals and missions, to creating conversation between institutions, and to providing access to research from other Jesuit institutions.

Both the AJCU and the IAJU regard Jesuit higher education as a leader in both Catholic higher education, as well as secular higher education (Association of Jesuit Colleges and

Universities, 2017; IAJU, 2018). This leadership and success stems from the focus on the Jesuit ideals of education that make these higher education institutions unique in an ever expanding and competitive field. As leaders and successful educators, Jesuit institutions can be a model for other institutions of higher education, especially in the realm of internationalization.

American Jesuit Higher Education & Study Abroad

In the United States Jesuit support for study abroad, student mobility, and educating students as global citizens is apparent by the missions of the institutions and their study abroad offerings. Of the 28 institutions, 26 include words such as "international/internationalization", "culture/cultural", "diverse/diversity", and "global/globe" in their institutional mission statements (Nguyen, 2018, p.106). Mission statements represent public announcements of what is valuable to an institution. This overwhelming inclusion of words designating internationalization efforts displays an articulated commitment to internationalization from a majority of American Jesuit institutions. In fact, five institutions include language that incorporate Jesuit values alongside internationalization with phrases such as, "international character", "global engagement", "global awareness", and "world leadership" (Nguyen, 2018, p.107). These rhetorical displays compound the ease at which internationalization efforts and Jesuit value align in the field of higher education.

Along with the international roots of the Jesuits, and their globally centered mission statements, American Jesuit higher education institutions demonstrate their commitment to global citizenship and internationalization through their promotion of student mobility and study abroad. As Nguyen explains, "Study abroad is part of the Jesuit mission of sending students to gain a multicultural awareness and to understand the global competency that extends beyond national boundaries" (Nguyen, 2018, p.113). All 28 institutions currently support study abroad

programs and three of these institutions currently rank among the top 25 institutions in the

United States leading undergraduate participation in study abroad (Institute for International

Education, 2018b). Considering the 28 Jesuit institutions make up less than one percent of all

higher education institutions in the country, their rankings on this list show a demonstrated

commitment to study abroad. Beyond the numbers, Jesuit institutions in the United States show

their commitment to study abroad through the AJCU's Study Abroad Consortium, a shared

programming initiative where students from all United States Jesuit institutions can participate in

abroad opportunities through other institutions in the consortium, giving their students more

opportunities (Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities 2017).

Due to the growing number of students engaging in this experience, it is imperative for

universities to understand the benefits and potential risks of offering these kinds of programs.

Currently, universities and study abroad experience providers herald studying abroad as an

opportunity to increase participants' cultural competency, improve fluency in a foreign language,

and provide memories that last a lifetime. Most research concerning American university

students studying abroad focuses on the experience itself or the positive effects of the

experience. An overwhelming amount of research focuses on the intercultural and linguistic

gains students achieve during a program abroad (Bacon, 2002; DeKeyser, 1991; Engberg, 2013;

Vande Berg et al., 2012). Other studies focus on the positive, professional and civic effects

studying abroad has on students (De Graf et. al, 2013; Horn & Fry, 2013). These studies center

on the positive outcomes that make studying abroad a worthwhile investment for students.

While this research provides important grounding as to why universities and countries should

support study abroad programs, this research fails to address the actual experiences of students

upon their return to their home institution. Indeed, compared with the overwhelming body of

research on the benefits of these programs, there is a lack of research surrounding the re-entry experience of students upon returning from abroad programs.

Methodology

In order to examine the ways in which and the extent to which American Jesuit universities support their returning study abroad students during re-entry, two forms of data collection were utilized; interviews with employees who oversee study abroad and international programming at American Jesuit universities, and website analysis of American Jesuit universities.

Participants

As this study focused on the implications for Jesuit universities and re-entry in the United States, the sample consisted of the 28 American Jesuit undergraduate universities currently in operation. If an institution did not run a study abroad program, they were eliminated from the sample. These institutions, spread out geographically across the continental United States, vary in size, prestige, and resources, offering a diverse sample of institutions. All 28 institutions were included in the website analysis portion of the data collection. Of these 28 institutions, 14 were selected for interviews through a convenience sampling. An anonymized participant list of these 28 institutions and their general size and geographic location can be found in Appendix B.

Procedure

Due to the varying geographic location of the participants, data was primarily collected remotely, and online resources were utilized. A general search of each institution's website provided the websites in which information concerning study abroad is maintained. For the

interview process, information gleaned from these study abroad websites was utilized to contact a representative from the office and to set up an interview. The email used to reach out to prospective participants briefly outlined the study and asked if the contact or someone in their office would be interested in participating. The full email can be found in Appendix C. Out of the schools contacted, 18 responded and 14 scheduled interviews, giving a 50 percent participation rate for the interviews.

The interviews were scheduled over an eight week period during which interviews occurred over the phone, over Zoom, or, in one case, in person. Each participant received a consent form, asking for permission to record the interviews, and the interview questions upon scheduling their interview. Individual signed consent forms were returned before the time of each interview. Each interview began with a reminder of the consent form and each participant was notified when the recording began and ended. The interviews followed the interview protocol found in Appendix D, asking questions concerning general information about the institution's study abroad participation, the existence of current re-entry programs, any future plans or interests in implementing re-entry supports, and the extent to which the Jesuit nature of the institution has an impact on the reasons behind any re-entry programming or the way that re-entry programming is conceptualized and delivered.

After each interview the audio recordings were transcribed. The data from each transcription was analyzed and coded, in relation to each of the four research questions guiding this study;

1. What programs or resources exist for students returning from abroad at your institution?

2. What challenges does your office face in providing more (or better) programs and resources for students when they return from abroad?

3. Are there any plans to increase (or enhance) resources for students returning from abroad in your office?

4. When you think about re-entry programming at your institution-- what you currently do or what you would like to see implemented-- do you see any particular connections between those efforts and the Jesuit ideals for education that guide your institution? In what ways?

Once coded by question, the data was analyzed to find common themes within each focus area, and to see outliers in the data.

After the interviews concluded, the website analysis began. Returning to each institution's study abroad associated website, the analysis examined whether or not re-entry resources had are present on the website. The number of clicks required to reach this information, the depth of information, and the advertisement or lack thereof for re-entry focused programming and support were all factors considered when examining the existence and depth of re-entry and compared across institutions.

Limitations

As this study examines a subgroup of universities, the findings may not be representative of American universities generally or Jesuit universities globally. As there is not an abundance of existing research concerning the state of re-entry resources at these institutions, this research is designed to be exploratory. As such, while these interviews and online resources uncover a great deal of information surrounding re-entry, they are in no way meant to represent the state of re-entry across all institutions. Notably, a majority of the information is self-reported, and the

participants' possibly bias should be taken into consideration. The researcher's own experience studying and working at an American Jesuit university should be considered as well.

Findings

Data for this study came from online resources and interviews with participants. The findings are grouped as such, for clarity and to designate when that data represents all 28 institutions versus when the data represents only the 14 interview participants.

Interview Data

Of the 28 institutions, 14 are represented through interview data. All 14 of the participants participated in the full interview, answering all of the questions in the interview protocol. Their demographic information is captured in Appendix B and their responses to the four main questions are summarized by the corresponding topic below.

Resources offered.

Every participating institution currently offers resources in some form for their returned study abroad students. These resources fall into four main categories: 1) large group meetings, 2) involvement within the study abroad office, 3) a collaboration with the study abroad office and another on campus office, and 4) web based resources. Half of the institutions utilize two additional resources, a regional re-entry conference and a re-entry class, which did not fall into any of the four major categories due to the nature of the resources and the variance of the resources among the institutions. While the resources can be grouped into these general categories, it is important to note the vast variety of resources between institutions, which

influences the analysis of the data. All of the resources offered at the 14 institutions are included in Table 1 below.

The most common resource offered by participants is a re-entry meeting for returned students. Ten of the 14 institutions offer this resource for students, with six of these institutions hold meetings with largely administrative and logistical objectives and four of these institutions hold meetings with a more social and informal approach. For two of these institutions, whose meetings take on a more administrative agenda, the re-entry meeting is mandatory for all students. At institutions where the meeting is not mandatory, participation rates vary greatly from a five percent participation rate at University E, to a 20 percent participation rate at University L.

Another popular resource offered by these institutions is involvement with the study abroad office. This involvement takes shape in variety of ways, through employment and volunteer opportunities, as well as involvement with pre-departure orientations and study abroad fairs. The most common opportunity through the study abroad office is a peer ambassador program. At some institutions, the peer ambassador is a paid position, but most often it is a volunteer position. Six of the 14 institutions support a peer ambassador program, with five of these institutions citing the ambassador program as their main or most successful re-entry resource. Respondents from these institutions also mention their peer ambassadors are typically the students speaking at study abroad fairs and pre-departure meetings if they support that resource.

Table 1

Resources Offered for Returned Study Abroad Students

Type of Resource	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
Meeting		x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x	
Social					x	x		x		x				
Administrative		x	x	x					x			x	x	
Advisor Contact				x					x					
Abroad Office	x	x	x		x	x	x	x		x				x
Volunteer Position	x				x	x		x		x				x
Employment		x			x		x							
Predeparture	x				x	x								x
Study Abroad Fair	x		x		x	x								x
On Campus														
Collaborations			x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x		
Career Services						x	x	x				x		
International Office			x		x			x		x	x			
Campus Ministry							x							
Resource Fair							x							
Web Based	x			x	x	x								
Email Series	x			x		x								
Return Specific Website	x			x										
Manual				x	x									
Other	x		x	x			x			x	x		x	
Regional Conference			x				x			x			x	
Class	x			x								x		

Another common resource consists of collaborations with other on campus offices. All four of the respondents with a collaboration with the career office discuss the importance of helping students understand how to market their study abroad experience for employment and graduate school. Of the respondents that support an event in collaboration with their international office, three mention that their offices are within the same department or within the same office, which aids in facilitating joint programming. Other on campus collaborations include a collaboration with a campus ministry office and a resource fair, which includes a variety of on campus offices at University G.

Some respondents also offer web based resources such as email series, online manuals, and a re-entry specific resource, such as a specific webpage. Of the four institutions offering these resources, three of them offer two of the three, with an email series found to be the most popular web based resource.

In addition to meetings, study abroad involvement, on campus collaborations, and web based resources, some institutions also offer classes and regionally based conferences. Universities C, G, J, and M each offer participation in their respective regional re-entry conference to their students, however participation for all of these institutions is consistently low, with numbers ranging between zero to five students each year. Additionally, University F previously offered a regional conference resource for students but no longer does so due to the conference no longer being held in their region. Three institutions, Universities A, D, and K, currently offer a re-entry class for students. At University A, the course currently enrolls five students and covers a variety of topics focusing in processing students' abroad experiences. While only enrolling a small number of students, University A notes this class as their biggest re-entry effort. At University D, the re-entry course is offered through a department that is not

connected to the study abroad office, and the course is not considered to be a collaboration with

the study abroad office; as such, available information about enrollment and topics was limited.

At University K, the course is mandatory for all students studying abroad and runs over two

semesters, the one prior to a student going abroad and the one immediately after an abroad

experience for students. The course following a student's experience abroad also focuses on

helping students process their time abroad.

Main challenges.

The interview data suggest that institutions mainly face challenges in regard to student

engagement and resource availability when welcoming students back to campus. All but two

institutions cite student engagement in the form of participation levels or willingness to connect

as one of the major challenges to re-entry programming. Universities C, D, G, L, and N also

discuss a difficulty in engaging students to due to students' difficulty in articulating and

acknowledging their need for support upon returning. All of the data related to challenges is

displayed in Table 2 below.

Many of these respondents also point to the "busyness" of their students' lives and the

difficulty in scheduling events at convenient times for students as major challenges. Universities

A, D, F, and H also discuss communication and reaching students as challenges to providing

resources to students.

Half of the institutions indicate resources, particularly in the form of staffing and funding,

as another major barrier to providing re-entry support to students. Respondents at Universities

B, J, and L note the difficulties in supporting students when their offices only employ between

one and three staff members. Respondents at Universities M and N, however, discuss staffing

shortages in relation to the large volume of students they support.

Universities G, J, L, and M also discuss a difficulty in gauging what students need when they return. These respondents consider the lack of participation they see as an indicator that their resources do not currently fulfill students' needs; however, the lack of communication between students and their offices hurts their ability to understand students' needs.

Future plans.

The majority of the respondents did not provide concrete plans for increasing or improving re-entry resources. Most institutions describe a "desire" or "interest" in adding new resources, particularly those that would provide a welcoming and fun option for students. A third of the institutions included in this study mentioned that while there is a need and interest in providing these resources, re-entry is just not a priority in their office. Half of the respondents currently engage in research of "best practices" in re-entry. Each of the respondents discusses very different ideas for moving forward with re-entry programming, due to their different successes or failures as well as their available resources.

University B mentions an interest in incorporating resources that are more fun and social. The respondent from University B also discusses plans to implement an ambassador program, a collaboration with career services, and a collaboration with the community engagement office. University M also expresses an interest in creating an annual meeting or dinner for returnees, and an interest in expanding the institution's current meeting to a series of meetings that cover a range of topics and include more social events. Universities E and F mention a desire to improve on current resources; both institutions are planning to utilize current students for ideas and suggestions, wanting to create more peer to peer resources. Universities G and J, however, explicitly discuss not having plans for improving or expanding their re-entry resources.

Table 2

Challenges for Universities

Challenge	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
Institution Resources		x			x	x	x			x		x	x	x
Staffing		x								x		x	x	x
Funding		x		x		x						x	x	
Student Engagement	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Participation		x	x			x	x	x		x			x	x
Willingness		x												x
Interest	x		x			x	x							
Scheduling	x	x					x		x	x				
Communication	x			x		x		x						
Acknowledging the Need			x	x			x					x		x

Jesuit ties.

All 14 participants do see a connection with their office, the re-entry resources they offer, and the Jesuit ideals that guide their institutions. Participants discussed characteristics of Jesuit education, including cura personalis, discernment, reflection, vocation, respect for the world, service for others, and international engagement. Reflection is the most common characteristic in re-entry programming among the 14 institutions, with 12 of the participants noting reflection as a part of their re-entry resources. A third of respondents note that the connection to Jesuit ideals is not done intentionally, and there is minimum effort to make the connection clear to

students. These respondents contribute the existence of Jesuit characteristics in their resources to the influence of their institution at large. Six of the respondents discuss the role of the social justice in their resources, pointing to an increased interest among students in social justice as the reason for the provision of service related opportunities in their re-entry programming.

Online Presence

Institutions display immense variation in regards to re-entry online. Just over half of all institutions discuss re-entry in some manner online, and the depth and manner varies greatly across institutions. Of the 28 institutions, 25 currently host a website for their study abroad office. The three institutions that do not have a study abroad website also do not have a separate office or department dedicated to study abroad. Of these 25 institutions, 16 currently have a re-entry specific website, accessible through their study abroad website. For 10 of these 16 institutions their re-entry website is only one click from their main study abroad webpage. For the other six institutions, five of them provide access to their re-entry page within two clicks and one institution provides access within three clicks. This information is displayed below in Table 3 and Table 4.

Table 3

Institutions A - N: Study Abroad Online Presence

Online Parameters	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
Study Abroad Landing Page	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Re-Entry Specific Web Page	x			x	x	x	x	x			x	x		x
Clicks to Re-Entry Page	1			1	1	2	1	2			1	1		2

Table 4

Institutions O - BB: Study Abroad Online Presence

Online Parameters	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	AA	BB
Study Abroad Landing Page	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x		x	x		x
Re-Entry Specific Web Page		x		x	x	x					x	x		x
Clicks to Re-Entry Page		2		1	1	1					3	2		1

The depth of information on these 16 websites range from a few sentences on transferring credits and course work to a detailed list of resources for a multitude of issues one might face upon returning. The range of offerings is detailed in Table 5 below. The most common occurrences on re-entry websites are resources for returning students, with 15 of the 16 institutions displaying re-entry programming directly online. Within the category of resources, options for students to share their experience with others either through recruiting events, peer ambassador programs, or making an appointment to speak with a staff member at the abroad office, were the most common type of resource shared. Other common type of resource advertised online falls under career resources. These resources typically offered an event run by the institution's career services, a list of tips for "marketing" a study abroad experience, or a list of opportunities to work internationally.

Institutions also included a range of resources to get involved in the community upon returning from abroad, ranging from volunteering in the surrounding area, working with international students at the institution, attending different community events, or opting for intercultural housing options. In addition, six institutions offered resources concerning the

difficulties students may face returning abroad. Institutions A, D, F, R, S, and Z all mentioned

the possibility of reverse culture shock and difficulty adjusting upon arrival back on campus.

While all slightly different in nature, each one offered suggestions on how to cope with such

difficulty, with two of the institutions providing links to counseling services. One institution

included a list of ways to identify someone may be experiencing reverse culture shock.

Half of the 16 institutions included administrative help for students returning from

abroad. For most of the institutions this help focused on how to ensure grades and credits from

abroad would transfer to a student's home institution, and provided a timeline of deadlines. For

four of these institutions procedures on how to register for classes, apply for housing, and return

to campus were also included.

Of the nine institutions that do have a study abroad specific website and do not have a

website dedicated to re-entry, four were interviewed and do indeed offer re-entry resources.

Three of the remaining five institutions that were not interviewed do mention re-entry and

suggestions for returning students in regards to credit and course transfer on their main study

abroad website. University O, one of these five institutions, includes suggestions to parents of

returned students that discuss the difficulties of returning to campus. Of the three institutions

without a study abroad specific website, no information was found relating to re-entry.

Table 5

Institutions with Re-entry Specific Web Pages & Their Offerings

University	A	D	E	F	G	H	K	L	N	P	R	S	T	Y	Z	BB
Administrative Help	x	x	x	x							x		x		x	x
Grade/Credit Transfer	x	x	x								x		x		x	x
Procedures	x	x	x								x					
Resources	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Sharing the Experience	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	
Community Resources	x	x			x	x		x			x	x	x			
Career Resources	x	x		x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
Mental Health Resources	x	x		x							x	x			x	
Other Re-Entry Resources	x		x	x	x	x		x				x				

Discussion

The findings of this study display the current state of re-entry across American Jesuit institutions. While the findings do not offer an in depth look at every institution, the responses of the participants and the online presences of re-entry indicate that American Jesuit universities provide support students returning from abroad in some regard. These efforts vary in manner and in level of commitment, and unfortunately, a few institutions do not provide any articulated support for re-entry. Generally, within institutions that do provide resources, respondents consider their current resources to be subpar or lacking in some manner. Regardless of their resource offerings, institutions encounter similar challenges in providing support and resources.

Respondents offer a grim outlook on re-entry; however the future plans for programming and the online presence of re-entry resources indicate potential for creating stronger re-entry support. Additionally, two institutions have found successful resources that attract high numbers of students and achieve the goal of providing resources that aid students in reflecting on and integrating their abroad experience once they return. These resources may not be the answer for all institutions, but their experiences offer insight into what can make successful resources for other institutions.

Importance of Providing Re-entry Support

The most salient finding is that American Jesuit institutions acknowledge the importance of supporting students during their return to campus, as evidenced through the abundance of websites dedicated to re-entry and the number of institutions offering resources for students returning. Overall, over 70 percent of the 28 total institutions make mention of the return and re-entry resources on their websites and all 14 institutions interviewed offer resources and/or suggestions to alleviate the stress of re-entry. The range of online resources available displays the wealth of support institutions could potentially offer students, as well as suggest the variety of needs students have upon their return. Respondents from over half of the interviews see a need for these resources, and 86 percent of respondents have plans to improve, expand, and change their current resources. These high participation rates in the implementation and improvement of re-entry resources demonstrate a clear importance of re-entry across the board. While respondents did acknowledge that re-entry is not and, typically, cannot be a priority in their respective office, it is an area they have desires to improve because there is a need among their students. This is an important first step in bringing attention to the return experience for

students, as institutions often do not acknowledge the need to support students throughout their re-entry (Vande Berg et al, 2012). However, supporting re-entry is an important step to incorporating study abroad as a tool to educate students to become global citizens, as well as a tool to move internationalization forward. Since American Jesuit institutions acknowledge this, and have begun the process to making study abroad truly integrative, these institutions can provide an example for other institutions.

This lack of acknowledgement from other institutions likely stems from a reported greater need in outbound students. Over half of the institutions interviewed cited the needs on their outbound side as one of the barriers to dedicating resources to re-entry. Institutions spoke to the greater amount of time, human capital, and funding that supports outbound students that is not, and could not be, shared with returning students. University D suggests this resource imbalance likely would never be remedied at that institution due to the greater visibility and greater need attributed to outbound students. As Vande Berg et al. points out, this is typical as outbound students are overwhelmingly the primary concern of offices in charge of sending students abroad (Vande Berg et al., 2012). The preparation needed to send students to live and study in a foreign country, including training and teaching students how to live abroad successfully and safely is of utmost importance for many institutions. When students return to campus, the fears and uncertainty are far less for the institution. That is not to say the concern for the safety and success of their students goes away when they return to campus, but rather that institutions already have support systems and safety precautions in place at their own campuses and, theoretically, have more control over what happens on their own campus.

In addition, since institutions typically have existing structures in place to provide a range of service to students, they may not see a need to provide additional resources, when other

offices on campus offer similar provisions. For example, even though University J and University F admitted there might be a need to support returning students, both institutions suggested that their study abroad focused office might not be the place students turn to for this need. University J suggested other offices on campus, such as the university's counseling services or the career center might be a better equipped office to serve students returning from abroad. University J explained the two main concerns their students have when they return from abroad, difficulty adjusting and aspirations to return abroad, would best be served by offices specifically designed to help students with mental health or career services. University F however, suggested students needed a place to talk to one another about their experiences. This institution suggested that getting involved and volunteering for clubs and other co-curricular activities would be the most beneficial for returned students, not necessarily programming through the study abroad office. While neither institution saw the need to provide resources through their office, they still commented on the need for resources for re-entry be provided for students, bolstering the fact that these resources are needed on campuses.

Resources Offered

The offerings across institutions suggest that re-entry at American Jesuit institutions is rather stagnant. Multiple institutions offer similar types of resources, typically meetings or peer ambassador programs, and there is not a lot of innovation in the resource offerings. If institutions reported high participation rates or offered positive feedback concerning their re-entry resources this lack of innovation might not be cause for alarm. However, the low participation rates pose a challenge for institutions that should be addressed through improving current resources or implementing new practices altogether.

Main Challenges

Furthermore, American Jesuit institutions are facing the same challenges when it comes to providing students with support and resources during their return to campus and the United States. Every major challenge respondents brought up was shared with at least one other institution, and most challenges were shared by four or more institutions.

The main challenge in providing resources comes from a lack of student engagement as 93 percent of respondents noted some aspect of student engagement as a challenge to providing re-entry resources to their students. While respondents typically did not place responsibility on the students for low attendance at existing events, they did identify students' busy schedules, responsibilities, and lack of willingness as major barriers to supporting students. Roughly half of respondents talked about the difficulty in choosing a time for their events as student schedules are so busy and demanding. Despite this, University I, University K, and University M, all find ways to fit their mandatory re-entry resources into their students' schedules. Each university's mandatory meeting, or class in the case of University K, is offered at multiple times however, demonstrating each institution's need to be somewhat flexible to the students' schedules. These three institutions are considered medium or small sized institutions, which may make it more feasible to create mandatory meetings. Additionally, University K did report a decline in participation rates for study abroad once initiating the mandatory class, suggesting that mandatory meetings may not be the best solution to engage students. Nonetheless, all three institutions illustrate options for providing students a space to reflect on, and digest their abroad experience upon their return.

In addition, a little over half of all respondents also identified university resources as a major challenge to providing re-entry resources to students. For many of the smaller institutions

interviewed the entire study abroad operation is run by one to three people, which makes it extremely difficult to balance recruiting students, approving applications, maintaining relationships with programs and third party providers, and supporting outbound students. In these offices, re-entry resources are still present, but all the harder to implement, improve, and gather data on. In larger offices where the responsibilities of re-entry programming may fall to one staff member, there often are not other resources, like funding, available. In none of the institutions interviewed, where one of the staff members explicitly is responsible for re-entry, was re-entry the only responsibility for the staff member. Oftentimes an advisor, who is also responsible for meeting with students, approving applications, and communicating with outbound students, would also be tasked with re-entry as an additional task.

For more than half of the institutions, respondents mentioned the newness of their position, their office, or the existence of re-entry resources. Five of the respondents have been in their position for less than two years, and many mentioned how their office had recently expanded or added another position. The newness of the practitioners and their offices creates another challenge as they gain footing and evaluate the effectiveness of what is currently occurring in their offices. The main goals of most study abroad offices is to send students abroad, and therefore the focus must first be on evaluating outbound students and practices before turning attention to returning students.

Re-entry and Jesuit Values

The experience of studying abroad relates strongly to the Jesuit mission, specifically the goals of educating students to be men and women for and with others, all over the world. Currently all of the institutions interviewed consider the Jesuit tradition of reflection to play a part in their re-entry programming. As one of the major tenets of Jesuit learning, and one of the

main features of Jesuit pedagogy, the inclusion of reflection certainly provides a connection to the Jesuit mission that guides these institutions (Mesa, 2017). However, this inclusion of reflection is not necessarily intentional for all of the participants and this lack of intentionality could undermine the Jesuit connection for these resources. While this lack of intentionality does not devalue the prevalence of reflection across institutions, it does offer room for institutions to improve their programming in line with the Jesuit mission.

Overall, institutions should incorporate more of the Jesuit mission into their study abroad programs. As the Jesuit mission calls for students to be attentive and to be reflective of their experiences, these exercises can easily be integrated into programming and resources for returning students once they return to campus. If institutions intend to utilize study abroad experiences to promote global education from the Catholic perspective, they must make an intentional effort to help students reflect on these experiences once they return.

Evaluating Re-entry Resources

Most of the institutions interviewed acknowledge their current resources are under resourced and do not garner high levels of student engagement. While institutions acknowledge the importance of supporting returned students, most institutions do not feel they are currently providing strong support for their students. Institutions often began their interviews with disclaimers, stating they were aware of their lack of re-entry resources and of their inability to engage most of the returned students. Even two of the institutions with mandatory re-entry programs acknowledge their lack of additional resources and programming for students.

The most common resources across institutions take the form of large groups meetings. These meetings may include administrative or social aspects, but they are all conducted on a

large group scale, intended to attract all of the students that fall into the "returned" category.

However, except in cases where the meeting is mandatory, participation rarely reaches more than

ten percent of students invited. Of the 10 institutions that offer meetings, eight reported a desire

to improve or change the meeting in some manner, mainly due to this lack of participation.

These institutions acknowledge this kind of "catch-all" meeting does not do the most to actively

support students as they return. However, in defense of this kind of resource, institutions do

report that this is an effective way to get administrative information out to students and provides

a place for students to talk about their experiences. At University H for example, even though

participation tends to stay around just over 10 percent of returned students, respondents claimed

those students that choose to attend are provided with an exceptional opportunity to talk about

their abroad experience, which students may not find otherwise on campus.

Three institutions spoke of programs they previously offered but no longer do so because

of the lack of engagement. These institutions are all currently offering different resources but

used their past attempts to illustrate the difficulty they face in finding the right fit for their

students' needs and interests.

Models of Success & Recommendations

While many institutions expressed a need to improve or expand their resources, a few

institutions provided examples of programs that are well attended and provide support to

students. The success of the following programs is self-reported by the institutions and is based

mainly off of student attendance and engagement. However, each of these institutions offer

examples of creative engagement and support of students during a little understood student

experience.

University E supports a Student Advisory Committee, comprised of returned students who meet roughly once a month and help plan programming for students going abroad and returning from abroad. Positions on the committee are paid and interested students must apply to be considered for the committee. Since the position is a paid on campus job, student motivation may be influenced by this incentive. However, the success of this program comes from the fact that the committee is student run and is responsible for the other re-entry programs the office offers. University E relies on this advisory committee to inform the institution of the struggles of returning to campus, as well as provide tangible ideas for how to alleviate these struggles. Since the inception of the advisory committee two years ago, University E has been able to implement suggestions into pre-existing re-entry resources that have increased overall participation. These suggestions, ranging from switching the timing of social events to providing more specific online resources to sharing their re-entry handbook earlier, are not changes the study abroad office would necessarily expect to vastly alter their participation rates. However, attendance at their "Welcome Back" social nearly doubled once input from their advisory committee was considered. Student feedback may not garner such dramatic results all the time, but using student input to inform and plan events for students can create programming that is more attractive to students.

University G offers a "Re-entry Resource Fair". The study abroad office organizes a resource fair comprised of on campus offices who provide opportunities for students to be engaged on campus and off campus partners who provide opportunities for students to return abroad or work abroad. The office, with the help of their volunteer peer ambassadors, invites offices and partners to come to the event once a year, and invites all students who have participated in a study abroad experience. The program offers resources that appeal to a wide

range of interest, and University G contributes its success to this variety. Like University E, University G capitalizes on student feedback in order to make their resource fair more attractive to other students. The resource fair avoids the common challenges of scheduling and lack of student engagement due to the nature of the event. The fair takes place over the course of an entire afternoon, allowing students to come and go during their free time. The fair is held at a central location on campus, creating visibility and almost forcing students to engage due to the centrality of the event. University G continues to see high attendance for this event and using student feedback to improve the event each year.

While these particular models may not be feasible for every institution, the shared characteristics can inform future programming efforts at other institutions. These two models are student run or are informed by student feedback. For institutions whose current events are poorly attended, asking for student feedback or suggestions should be the first step they take to improve their resources. One of the most successful resources that relies on student feedback across institutions takes the form of a peer ambassador program. These programs, whether paid positions or volunteer positions, are by far the most popular among students. All eight institutions that offer such a position have found so much popularity that they have capped the number of available positions, and typically require interested students to apply for the position. These roles have different responsibilities at each institution but most of the time they involve talking to prospective study abroad students about their experience abroad. The time commitment and number of responsibilities varies at institutions but the interest from students does not.

University B suggests the overwhelming interest in a resource like a peer ambassador position stems from the ability of students to talk about their abroad experience. Both University

A and University E cite the need to talk about and reflect about their experience the most common reason students reach out to their office upon returning from abroad. Aligning with the student feedback from one Jesuit university, students typically do not need large, extravagant events or resources when they return from abroad. Rather students crave an opportunity to speak about their experience, to share with others who understand what they are thinking, and to have a time to reflect. While institutions may not see high participation rates in events or programs that simply over a place for students to talk and reflect, these opportunities offer the potential of providing more substantial reflection and processing for students that equally low attendance, costly events.

Online presence.

In addition to creating more student informed programming, Jesuit American institutions should devote more energy and resources to bolstering the online presence of information surrounding re-entry and re-entry support offered at each institution. Over half of American Jesuit institutions already host a re-entry specific website. Providing this online visibility for re-entry is imperative to providing resources for students. Today, more than ever before, students rely on technology to find answers to their questions. If the answers to questions such as, "what's next now that I'm back from abroad?" or "who can I talk to about my abroad experience?", or "how can I get involved now that I'm back?" are posted online, students are the ones who will find them. The answers to these questions for more than half of American Jesuit institutions can be found online through just a clicks, offering hope for the future to re-entry programming.

The wealth of information offered online by 15 of the 16 institutions with online resources proposes providing information concerning re-entry is fairly easy, especially since

much of the information concerning adjusting and reverse culture shock were nearly identical across institutions. American Jesuit institutions that do not currently advertise re-entry resources can very easily access the re-entry websites of institutions that do offer such resources online for ideas of how to anticipate returned students' questions, and how to answer these questions. At the national level, the AJCU should offer some online resources for their member institutions that can be informed by what these 15 institutions are already advertising. Updating websites to anticipate common student concerns does not require a lot of resources, but can potentially reach more students than in person programming or events.

Limitations & Further Research

Exploratory in nature, this data only provides an examination into the current state of re-entry for American Jesuit universities. The interviews conducted for this study only provide data from half of the American Jesuit universities. This group of institutions is a very small subgroup of institutions within the United States, and an even smaller sector within the global context. The findings and analysis included here cannot be generalized to all institutions in the United States, or all Jesuit institutions around the globe. In addition, the findings and analysis serve primarily to open up the conversation and offer a preliminary look at re-entry within the context of American Jesuit institutions. Within this group of institutions there are still questions to explore. How these institutions can effectively improve re-entry resources, and how these institutions can intentionally tie their study abroad and re-entry resources into their Jesuit mission and their internationalization efforts are two possible places for further inquiry.

Additionally, more information is needed to understand how re-entry and study abroad can strengthen the international network of Catholic institutions. Currently this network is one

of largest cross national higher education networks in the world, with over hundreds of institutions in countries all around the globe (de Wit et al. 2018). With integrative education at the core of Catholic education, the realm of study abroad, including re-entry, is a prime opportunity for collaboration between Catholic institutions near and far.

In general, research surrounding re-entry and the return for students is lacking. More information about the return, from a broader range of institutions, could illuminate the status of re-entry across other kinds of institutions. An examination of the different factors that might affect the state of re-entry resources, such as institution size, the number of students traveling abroad, and the resources allocated to study abroad offices, could further the conversation regarding re-entry in the United States and around the world.

Additionally, further research can examine how re-entry is considered and supported in other countries and in other regions of the world. Further research should look to see if the trends present in this cluster of institutions are present across the nation, and if these trends are global as well. With more information surrounding re-entry nationally, institutions would have more access to the best practices of re-entry support across the field. Additional research could look at if any institutions are providing support through different offices or if students are seeking support from different offices on campus.

Conclusion

This analysis into the intersection of higher education, Jesuit values, and study abroad is just a glimpse into the complicated role these institutions must assume when they send students abroad. The interviews and website data demonstrate a desire and interest to provide re-entry resources for students and feasible and successful manners in which institutions can do so. The

return and the re-entry experience for students continues to be under researched and, therefore, a challenge for institutions. However, re-entry support is the first step American Jesuit institutions can take to ensure their study abroad programs are providing students with complete experiences that lead to cultivating global citizens and individuals prepared for an ever-internationalizing world. Jesuit institutions, as leaders in Catholic education and secular education, should partner with one another to produce more intentional and integrative study abroad programs that include support for returned students that incorporates these international experiences into home institutions seamlessly. As internationalization continues to progress and pervade into all corners of the university, and as students must be prepared for an ever globalizing world, Jesuit institutions are in a prime setting to take advantage of the benefits of students studying abroad.

However, this responsibility does not fall solely on the heads of Jesuit institutions or American institutions. Institutions of all backgrounds, secular or not, must engage in the conversation of re-entry and improving student mobility as a tool for internationalization. Comprehensive internationalization at institutions of higher education involves active participation from a range of actors, operating at different levels with the organization of an institution. Student mobility, and study abroad, cannot operate independent of the rest of the institution if these experiences are meant to be integrative educational opportunities for students. In some situations a rethinking of study abroad, and the role it plays as a tool of internationalization may be necessary to fully incorporate the benefits of global experiences into domestic students' experiences.

Supporting students, engaging them in conversations, and challenging them inside the classroom and outside of it are all aspects of higher education that support the goal of educating students to be global citizens. While the future of higher education and the future

internationalization may be unpredictable, that is no excuse for ignoring the opportunities at hand within study mobility and study abroad, through supporting re-entry. During this particularly tumultuous political climate, humanity can only benefit from educating students to be global citizens— individuals who understand difference, who appreciate new perspectives and views, and who will bring solidarity to the world.

References

Altbach, P. (1991). Impact and adjustment: Foreign students in comparative perspective. *Higher Education, 21*(3), 305-323.

Arrupe, P., Jesuits, & International Congress of Jesuit Alumni of Europe. (1974). *Men for others : Education for social justice and social action today*. Washington, D.C.: Jesuit Secondary Education Association.

Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities. (2017). AJCU Study abroad consortium. Retrieved from http:// http://www.ajcunet.edu/study-abroad-consortium/

Bacon, S. (2002). Learning the rules: Language development and cultural adjustment during study abroad. *Foreign Language Annals, 33*(6), 637-646.

Boston College. (2014). A pocket guide to Jesuit education. Chestnut Hill, MA: Boston College.

Brubaker, C. (2017). Re-Thinking Re-Entry: New Approaches to Supporting Students after Study Abroad. *Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German, 50*(2), 109-119.

Chappell, L.; Inaldo, J.; While, M.; & Pirani, C. (2008). *Providing Post-Study Abroad Support-It's Easier Than You Think!* Presented at the 2008 NAFSA National Conference in Washington D. C.

Clarke, L. (2016). How expats cope with losing their identity. *British Broadcasting Corporation.* Retrieved from BBC.com.

DeGraaf, D.; Slagter, C.; Larsen, K. & Ditta, E. (2013). The long-term personal and professional impacts of participating in a study abroad program. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 23*, 42-59.

DeKeyser, R. (1991). Foreign language development during a semester abroad. In Barbara F.

Freed (Ed.), *Foreign language acquisition: Research and the classroom* (pp.104-119). Lexington, MA: DC Heath.

de Wit, H. (1999). Changing rationales for the internationalization of higher education. *International Higher Education*, (15).

de Wit, H. (2011). Internationalization of Higher Education: Nine Misconceptions. *Journal of International Higher Education, 64*, 6-7.

de Wit, H. & Merkx, G. (2012). The history of internationalization of higher education. In D. K. Deardorff, J. de Wit & J. D. Heyl. *The SAGE handbook of international higher education* (pp. 43-60). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Flack, M. (1976). Results and Effects of Study Abroad. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 424*, 107-117.

Garbati, J., & Rothschild, N. (2016). Lasting Impact of Study Abroad Experiences: A Collaborative Autoethnography. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 17*(2).

Gordon, Dennis (2003) "Jesuit International Education: Current Approaches and Challenges," Conversations on Jesuit Higher Education: Vol. 23, Article 3.

Gray, K. M., & Savicki, Victor. (2015). Study Abroad Reentry: Behavior, Affect, and Cultural Distance. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad, 26*, 264-278.

Horn, A., & Fry, S. (2013). Promoting Global Citizenship Through Study Abroad: The Influence of Program Destination, Type, and Duration on the Propensity for Development Volunteerism. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations, 24*(4), 1159-1179.

Hoyt, E. (1961). Integration of Culture: A Review of Concepts. *Current Anthropology, 2*(5), 407-426.

Institute of International Education. (2018a). Open Doors. Fast facts on US students studying

      abroad online. Retrieved from http://www.iie.org/en/Research-and

      publications/ /media/Files/Corporate/Open-Doors/Fast-Facts/Fast-Facts-2018.ashx.

Institute of International Education. (2018b). Open Doors. Leading Institutions. Retrieved from

      https://www.iie.org/en/Research-and-Insights/Open-Doors/Data/US-Study-Abroad/Lead

      ng-Institutions.

Juhasz, A.M, & Walker, A.M. (1987). The impact of study abroad on university students'

      perceptions of self. *Foreign Language Annals, 45*(4), 494-511.

Kartoshkina, Y. (2015). Bitter-sweet reentry after studying abroad. *International Journal of*

      Intercultural Relations, 44, 35-45.

Knight, J. (2015). Updating the Definition of Internationalization. *Journal of International*

      Higher Education, 33, 2-3.

Levin, R. (2013). *The Worth of the University*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Lucas, C.J. (2006) Higher Learning in Antiquity. In: *American Higher Education*. Palgrave

      Macmillan, New York.

Marx, H. A., & Moss, D. M. (2015). Coming Home: Continuing Intercultural Learning during

      the Re-Entry Semester Following a Study Abroad Experience. *Journal of International*

      Social Studies, 5(2), 38-52.

Mesa, J. (2017). *Ignatian pedagogy : Classic and contemporary texts on Jesuit education from*

      St. Ignatius to today. Loyola Press.

Mikal, J. (2011). When Social Support Fits into Your Luggage: Online Support Seeking and

      Its Effects on the Traditional Study Abroad Experience. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary*

      Journal of Study Abroad, 21, 17-40.

NAFSA. (2018) Re-Entry. Retrieved from

      https://www.nafsa.org/findresources/default.aspx?catId=518271

Nash, D. (1976). The personal consequences of a year of study abroad. J*ournal of Higher*

      Education, 42(2), 191-203.

Newman, J. H. (1852). *The Idea of a University*. Nine Discourses Delivered to the Catholics of

      Dublin. Retrieved from http://www.newmanreader.org/works/idea/index.html

Nguyen, B. (2018). Regional Perspectives from the USA: Understanding Internationalization

      Efforts in the Jesuit Higher Education Network. In de Wit, H., Bernasconi, A., Car, V.,

Hunter, F., James, M., & Veliz, D. (Eds). *Identity and Internationalization in Catholic*

      Universities. Boston, MA: Brill Sense.

Nguyen, B.; de Wit, J.; James, M.;, & McQuillan, P. (2018). *Internationalization at Jesuit*

      Colleges and Universities in the United States: Tensions between the Jesuit Mission and

      Internationalization in Strategic Plans, ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

Paige, R. M.; Cohen, A. D.; Kappler, B.; Chi, J.C.; & Lassegard, J. P. (2002) *Maximizing Study*

      Abroad: A Student's Guide to Strategies for Language and Culture Learning and Use.

      Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota.

Presbitero, A. (2016). Culture shock and reverse culture shock: The moderating role of cultural

      intelligence in international students' adaptation. *International Journal of Intercultural*

      Relations, 53, 28-38.

Reynolds-Case, A. (2013). The Value of Short-Term Study Abroad: An Increase in Students'

      Cultural and Pragmatic Competency. *Foreign Language Annals,46*(2), 311-321.

United States Department of Education. (2011). Study Abroad: Enhancing International and

      Area Studies. Retrieved from

https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/iegps/study-abroad.html

United States Department of Education. (2012). International Strategy 2012 - 2016: Succeeding

Globally Through International Education and Engagement.

United States Department of State. (2018). USA Study Abroad. Retrieved from

https://studyabroad.state.gov/value-study-abroad/why-study-abroad

Vande Berg, M., Paige, R. M., & Lou, K. H. (2012). *Student learning abroad : What our

students are learning, what they're not, and what we can do about it* (First ed.). Sterling,

Virginia: Stylus Publishing, LLC.

What We Do: Education. (2017). Retrieved from

http://jesuits.org/whatwedo?PAGE=DTN-20130520123631

Young, G. (2014). Reentry: Supporting Students in the Final Stage of Study Abroad. *New

Directions for Student Services,2014*(146), 59-67.

Zelizer, B. (Ed.). (2011). *Making the University Matter*. New York, NY: Routledge, Taylor and

Francis Group.

Appendix A

List of Jesuit Universities in the United States Alphabetized

Boston College
Canisius College
College of the Holy Cross
Creighton University
Fairfield University
Fordham University
Georgetown University
Gonzaga University
John Carroll University
Le Moyne College
Loyola Marymount University
Loyola University Chicago
Loyola University Maryland
Loyola University New Orleans
Marquette University
Regis University
Rockhurst University
Saint Joseph's University
Saint Louis University
Saint Peter's University
Santa Clara University
Seattle University
Spring Hill College
University of Detroit Mercy
University of San Francisco
University of Scranton
Wheeling Jesuit University
Xavier University

Appendix B

List of Participants

University	Geographic Location*	Size of Institution**	Participated in Interviews
A	Midwest	Large	Yes
B	South	Small	Yes
C	Midwest	Medium	Yes
D	South	Large	Yes
E	Midwest	Large	Yes
F	Northeast	Medium	Yes
G	Midwest	Medium	Yes
H	Midwest	Large	Yes
I	Northeast	Medium	Yes
J	South	Medium	Yes
K	West	Medium	Yes
L	South	Medium	Yes
M	Northeast	Small	Yes
N	Northeast	Large	Yes
O	Midwest	Small	No
P	Northeast	Medium	No
Q	Northeast	Large	No
R	Northeast	Small	No
S	West	Medium	No
T	West	Medium	No
U	South	Very Small	No
V	Northeast	Small	No
W	Northeast	Medium	No
X	South	Small	No
Y	West	Medium	No
Z	West	Medium	No
AA	Midwest	Medium	No
BB	West	Large	No

Based on United States Census Bureau-designated regions

**Based on Carnegie Classifications of Higher Education Institutions*

Appendix C

Participant Recruitment Email

Dear XXX,

My name is Kaitlyn Solano and I am a graduate student studying International Higher Education at Boston College. I am conducting research for my master's thesis examining the extent to which American Jesuit universities provide support for students when they return from study abroad experiences. I am emailing to ask if you, or someone in your office at [university name], would like to take part in this study by participating in a 20 minute interview discussing what re-entry looks like at your university.

Participation is completely voluntary and your responses will be anonymous. I have attached both the informed consent form and the interview questions for your convenience. If you would be interested in participating please let me know the best method by which to conduct the interview (either via phone or Zoom [or in person, depending on the school]) and what days and times work best for you. If you believe there is someone in your office better suited to contact in regards to this study please let me know who I should contact.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me or my faculty adviser, Dr. Laura Rumbley (rumbley@bc.edu).

Thank you for your time.

Appendix D

Interview Protocol

Demographic Information

1.   Could you please state your position within your organization?

2.   Roughly how many students participate in study abroad programs at your institution each

year?

Re-entry Programming

1.   What programs or resources exist for students returning from abroad at your institution?

a.   If none, do you see a need for these programs at your institution?

b.   If they do exist, what levels of participation do you see in these programs?

2.   What challenges does your office face in providing more (or better) programs and

resources for students when they return from abroad?

3.   Are there any plans to increase (or enhance) resources for students returning from abroad

in your office?

4.   When you think about re-entry programming at your institution-- what you currently do

or what you would like to see implemented-- do you see any particular connections

between those efforts and the Jesuit ideals for education that guide your institution? In

what ways?

5.   Is there anything else I should know about re-entry at your institution?

Appendix E

Adult Consent Form

What is the Research?

The primary purpose of this study is to understand to what extent and in what ways American Jesuit universities support students returning from abroad. The research looks primarily at the resources available to students at the present and what progress is being made in regards to re-entry.

Why have I been asked to take part?

You are a full time employee at a study abroad office, or its equivalent, at an American Jesuit university. This interview will consist of 5 to 10 questions and will last approximately 20 minutes. The topics to be discussed in this interview will concern the programs offered by your office in regards to re-entry and any future plans to implement such programs.

Voluntary Participation

This discussion is voluntary—you do not have to participate if you do not want to. If you do not take part, it will have no effect on your relationship with Boston College. If any questions make you feel uncomfortable, you do not have to answer them. You may end the interview at any time for any reason.

Risks

There are no known risks to participating in this study, **however there may be unknown risks associated with participating.**

Benefits

The benefit is largely to gather generalizable knowledge about the reentry experience of students who participate in study abroad programs across Jesuit universities. There are no known benefits for individuals participating in the study, apart from the satisfaction of possibly contributing to improved practices across universities in regard to study abroad re-entry support, which may benefit future students. Some participants may also find it interesting and rewarding to reflect on the offerings and practices of their offices in regards to re-entry in a focused and formal fashion.

Privacy

Your privacy will be protected. Your name will not be used in any report that is published. Your associated institution will be kept private as well. Regulators, sponsors, or Institutional Review Board Members that oversee research may see research records to make sure that the researchers have followed regulatory requirements. All research data will be stored on a private server and the hard copies will be destroyed after the interview has been studied.

Your Consent

By signing this document, you are agreeing to be in this study. Make sure you understand what the study is about before you sign. I will give you a copy of this document for your records. I will keep a copy with the study records. If you have any additional questions about the evaluation, **you may contact the Principal Investigator, Kaitlyn Solano, via email at solanok@bc.edu or via phone at 203-913-5939, or the Faculty Adviser, Dr. Laura Rumbley via email at laura.rumbley@bc.edu.** If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you may contact the Boston College Office for Research Protections at (617) 552-4778 or irb@bc.edu.

I understand what the study is about and my questions so far have been answered. I agree to take part in this study.

_____
Name

_____
Signature

_____
Date

Consent to be Audio/video Recorded
I agree to be audio/video recorded for the duration of the interview.

_____ YES   _____NO

_____   _____
Signature   Date