

Assessment and Evaluation of the EU Simulation

Paper Prepared For

*Stimulating Simulations:
Roundtable on the Use of Simulations for Teaching the EU*

1999 European Community Studies Association
Sixth Biennial International Conference
Pittsburgh, PA
2-5 June 1999

Gretchen J. Van Dyke, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Political Science
University of Scranton, Scranton, PA
Vandykegl@UofS.edu
(570) 941-4307

PLEASE NOTE:

This is a preliminary draft, and thus not yet available for citation or publication.

Assessment and Evaluation of the EU Simulation

By
Gretchen J. Van Dyke, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Political Science
University of Scranton, Scranton PA

For the past six years, students from colleges and universities in Pennsylvania and Maryland have been meeting in Washington, D.C., each December to participate in a special educational experience: a three-day simulation of the European Union's decision-making institutions and policy-making processes. This program is co-sponsored and coordinated by the European American Institute and the Pennsylvania/Maryland Consortium of the European Union, and it is based on a similar, ongoing program that a group of New York State schools founded in 1988. While only three schools and 34 students participated in the first Pennsylvania/Maryland simulation, the program has grown to include nearly 200 students in 1998, representing up to 14 different undergraduate institutions and specific EU members. The goal for 1999 is the inclusion of 15 schools, thus allowing for a perfect mirror of current EU membership. The 1999 program will also formally include graduate level M.A. students for the first time.

The Pennsylvania/Maryland European Union simulation program can be viewed as nothing less than an overwhelming success, particularly in terms of its unique ability to help students merge academic knowledge about the European Union with practical application in EU politics and policy-making. In fact, the student participants have consistently and continuously maintained that the EU simulation has been one of the best--if not *the* best--experiences of their

entire college careers. Therefore, several of us who serve as faculty advisors and coordinators for the programs deemed it important to share our expertise and insights about this simulation with our colleagues in the broader academic community. We not only see this program as an exciting pedagogical model in general; it is also an excellent means for teaching students about the intricacies of the EU and the complexity of European integration--clearly one of the most important and fascinating stories in the international system today.

Two colleagues have prepared papers on different aspects of the Pennsylvania/Maryland simulation: one examines the simulation's organization, goals, and yearly technicalities from the perspective of one of the founders; the other assesses the pedagogical challenges of integrating theoretical academic debates from international relations and comparative politics into a specialized course on the European Union. The essay that follows is another piece to the puzzle: it evaluates student and faculty involvement in our EU program as part of this group's broader effort to assess the value of the EU simulation as a pedagogical tool. This particular study is broken into two specific sections, each having a distinct question. The first part examines the various participants (schools and students), why they have chosen the simulation program as part of their educational venture, and how they prepare for this experience as a result. The second part assesses the impact of the simulation experience on both students and faculty, after the fact, by discussing the kinds of activities that they have undertaken as either a direct or indirect result of their participation. The data that is presented and analyzed in this study was gathered in a January 1999 survey that was sent to and subsequently completed by 13 faculty from 13 schools

that have participated in past simulations.¹ A list of faculty who completed the surveys and the institutions with which they are affiliated is included at the end of this paper (Appendix A), as is a copy of the survey itself (Appendix B).

Who Participates and Why, and How Do They Prepare?

The Institutions

While the range of colleges and universities in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of Maryland is as diverse as that in many states and regions of the country, the group of institutions that have been part of the Pennsylvania/Maryland Consortium on the European Union tend to be more homogeneous, most of which share a couple basic characteristics: they are primarily smaller colleges and universities in which a great deal of emphasis is placed on undergraduate teaching, and the faculty-student relationship, therefore, is considered paramount. The sixteen schools that have participated in the program in at least one of the six simulations so far have included: Elizabethtown College; Franklin & Marshall College; Gettysburg College; Hood College; Kutztown University; Lafayette College; Lehigh University; Lynchburg College; Millersville University; Mount St. Mary's College (MD); Muhlenberg College, Shippensburg

¹ A total of 17 surveys for 14 schools were circulated by this author; she completed the survey based on the University of Scranton's participation in the program since 1996. Two faculty from Kutztown University completed the survey. Dr. Edward DeClair, faculty advisor at Lynchburg College, VA, provided information for participants from Lynchburg's first year at the simulation (1998) as well as from Gettysburg College, whose students he had prepared for the 1993-97 simulations. While two surveys were set to both Hood College and York College (each has two faculty advisors), only one survey was returned by each of these schools. The surveys that were sent to the individual faculty advisor at both Lehigh University and Mt. Saint Mary's College (MD) were not returned to the author. The author thanks her colleagues for their willingness to complete the survey and to provide useful data for this study.

University; Susquehanna University; University of Scranton; Villanova University; West Chester University; and, York College. The 1999 simulation will included the participation of Drexel University undergraduates as well as first-year M.A. students from Beaver College's new graduate program in international diplomacy. Further, contact has been made with appropriate individuals at St. Joseph's University in Philadelphia about its possible inclusion in the December 2000 program.

Involvement by most of these institutions, whether they are public or private, has caused many of the faculty advisors to come face-to-face with the financial realities and the numerous fluctuations of higher education today, which have affected some schools' ability to maintain their participation or to offer the level of preparation that some faculty would prefer. In fact, personnel changes, personnel restraints, curriculum constraints, and budgetary restrictions have influenced virtually all aspects of this program, such as (to name just few examples): what schools will participate in any given year; whether students are prepared for the simulation in a one-credit or three-credit course; and, the mode of transportation used by individual schools and the length of each institution's stay in Washington, D.C., each December. These kinds of restrictions have forced Elizabethtown, Franklin & Marshall, Gettysburg, Millersville, Shippensburg, and Villanova to take leaves of absence from the simulation in certain years; yet, the program itself has continue to grow and all but one of the these schools remain committed to the program in general. One must conclude that the overwhelmingly positive reactions of the students themselves is a fundamental reason that faculty continue to bring delegations to Washington each year. This point is, perhaps, best summarized by one of the program's founding

members from Millersville University, Dr. Kirsten N. Bookmiller: "[The students] have nearly unanimously...called [the simulation] their best educational experience of their college careers."²

The Students

Nearly 725 students have participated in the Pennsylvania/Maryland European Union simulation program since its inception six years ago; schools that completed the survey account for approximately 570, or about 78%, of those participants. Not surprisingly, most students typically are Political Science, History, or International Studies/International Affairs majors. Yet, survey respondents also identified Modern Language (Spanish, French, and German), International Business, Economics, Environmental Science, Communications/Journalism, Education, and Philosophy as the other majors that have been represented in their student delegation pools. The University of Scranton even brought four students from its School of Management to the 1997 simulation, and a graduate student in its Masters in History program to the 1996 simulation.

Students' attraction to the simulation program is as varied as the academic majors that they represent. One catalyst is the simple fact that the preparatory course of five schools fulfills a major or minor academic requirement. Eleven survey respondents also cited students' interest in International Relations, eight cited students' interest in European Politics and History, and six cited students' interest in Comparative Politics as underlying motivations for students' interest. Faculty respondents also identified numerous other "qualitative" features of the program that often elicited student involvement: the simulation itself; the hands-on, practical training in politics via

² Direct Quotation, Kirsten N. Bookmiller, Ph.D., Millersville University, in response to: "Have your students been pleased with the quality of the EU simulation experience (particular aspects and in general)? Please explain." in January 1999 Survey Concerning The European American Institute/Pennsylvania-Maryland Consortium European Union Simulation Program.

the simulation; the simulation as a "fun" activity; the opportunity to refine debate, argumentation, and public speaking skills; the opportunity for close interaction with individual faculty; student interest in a small class or seminar experience; the attractiveness of travel to Washington, D.C., because of an interest in the political institutions that students visit during the program; and, the value of the simulation as a résumé builder for graduate school and job applications and interviews. Eight schools have welcomed the participation and unique insights of a variety of foreign students, whose homelands literally circle the globe: Ireland, Netherlands, France, Germany, Switzerland, Finland, Italy, Bulgaria, Bosnia, Greece, Turkey, Belarus, Ukraine, Ghana, India, Japan, and Brazil have all been represented in the delegation pools. Two faculty also noted that several of their students had studied abroad in EU member nations (Great Britain, Spain, Finland, Austria, and Germany), and one other faculty member pointed out that several of his students were children of Vietnamese immigrants to the United States. Clearly the diversity of majors, academic expertise, educational and practical experiences and interests, as well as the range of ethnic backgrounds, have enhanced the learning processes and preparations within the various school delegations and added a powerful dynamic to the simulation meetings in Washington. Those same variables also seem to be the primary reasons that students are enticed to the European Union simulation program itself.

The Preparation

Student preparation is undertaken in a variety of ways and in an assortment of educational settings. Moreover, training is necessarily structured according to the idiosyncracies that govern each school's participation in general (budgetary restraints, faculty expertise, faculty constraints, etc.). Six of the 13 schools reported that students apply for and are subsequently enrolled in a

specific class on the European Union; three others have had open enrollment for a special EU class. Two schools prepare students by enrollment in a general International Relations class that incorporates a special section on the European Union, while one school integrates a special EU component into a broader European Politics class. Shippensburg University, which did not participate in the simulation in 1998 but did send delegations in each of the previous four years, traditionally chose students who were matriculating in several different political science courses and trained them for the EU program in special weekly two-hours sessions throughout the fall semester. Lafayette College has also taken a different approach: its delegation emerges from a special college-wide International Affairs Club that stems directly from its International Affairs major. Even though most schools have chosen to structure student preparation within the framework of a formal course, students from different schools have received varied levels of academic credit for those classes (for example, Millersville and Scranton students traditionally have received three credits, but Hood students have only received one credit). While this unevenness may seem unfair and even unfortunate at times, it is an issue that is set by the administration at each school, and one over which the Consortium obviously has no control. Other idiosyncracies shape the nature of preparations at Kutztown and West Chester: at the former, two History Department faculty teach the EU class as an independent study on a course overload; at the latter, the special EU class is taught as a capstone seminar for senior or advanced Political Science majors.

Students naturally come to this preparation having taken a vast array of courses, some of which are required at particular school and some that are not. Eleven of thirteen respondents specifically identified either International Relations or Comparative Politics as courses that

students were likely to have taken prior to the enrollment in the simulation program. Moreover, the University of Scranton actually required participants to have background in at least one of those areas; Millersville has require at least one course in IR, Comparative, International Organization, or International Studies for program enrollment. Four schools cited European History and European Politics as other possible elements in their students' academic backgrounds, and seven respondents indicated that International Studies, International Organization, Economics, several modern languages, and Western Civilization and Culture tended to be academic building blocks for their delegations. While none of the above were considered to be requirements for participation, all certainly would be considered valuable academic training for the simulation program.

Faculty identified a variety of pedagogical tools that are used during their preparatory processes, including: lectures, detailed discussions, class presentations, and research papers on EU individual member nations (particularly the government and politics of the one that each school will represent), EU decision-making institutions and processes, Parliamentary party groupings, alter-egos, the simulation's primary issue (environment, monetary union, etc.). as well as related secondary issues (the EU Budget, common agriculture policy, regional and structural funding, etc.). Obviously, the schools that prepare students within the context of a specific course on the EU have the chance to examine these topics in far greater detail than the schools that accomplish this task in a broader or more relaxed academic setting. In fact, at least three of the faculty who offer a special EU class said that they require students to keep up with European issues through the media, particularly The New York Times and The Economist, and this is in addition to the other readings and requirements for those classes. There is general agreement among the faculty

that the Internet has been a particularly important vehicle for obtaining relevant, up-to-date information on all of these specific issues. Other faculty recognized the merits of guest speakers, of mock debates, of small in-class simulations, and of various multimedia tools in the preparatory process.

Just as the forum for preparation necessarily reflects and fits the demands and constraints of each institution, so do the technical approaches and devices that individual faculty employ in the preparatory process. It is virtually impossible to dictate a uniform code for preparation when so many factors influence both institutional and student participation each year. Moreover, while some faculty have advocated the implementation of nothing less than a common reading list for all student participants, even that element has been almost impossible to implement and enforce up to this point, precisely because the idiosyncratic nature of these institutions, which also naturally yields this high degree of diversity.

Post-Simulation Assessment: What Happens After the Simulation Experience?

The Students

While no student participants were surveyed or interviewed for this study, the faculty who completed the author's survey did provide some valuable information about how their students have responded to the European Union simulation experience in general, and particular activities that students have pursued in response to their involvement in this program.³ Several faculty

³ Eight of the thirteen schools that are represented in this paper indicated that they do conduct a formal assessment of the simulation each year, by using either institutional student evaluations or European American Institute questionnaires--or both--to gauge students' reactions to the program. All respondents indicated that valuable information has also been gathered by means of informal evaluations, particularly conversations with individual student participants.

pointed to specific elements of the EU simulation program that garnered special favor with students, such as the individual embassy briefings, the visit to the U.S. Department of State, and the satellite teleconference with the EU Commission and Parliament; all others simply indicated that students consistently were pleased and excited with the totality of the simulation experience. Dr. Peter Loedel, faculty advisor at West Chester University, offered the most striking testimony about his students' reaction to the simulation experience--a perspective which most of the faculty would probably agree nicely highlights the value of this program in the minds of the student participants:

Students have been pleased especially with the opportunity to meet other students, to interact with a wide-variety of people with different backgrounds, to demonstrate and employ many of the skills and/or theories they have learned in the classroom, and to experience, as close as possible, the "real" world of politics. In general, the students enjoy the experience, have fun, get to know faculty and peers, and [love] the drama of being in Washington, D.C., instead of the classroom.⁴

It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the enthusiasm that the EU simulation program generates compels program alumni to pursue related undergraduate coursework and graduate programs, and to seek job opportunities in which they can continue refining their new-found knowledge and academic skills in either a direct or indirect way.

All but one faculty respondent indicated that many non-graduating student participants continued to pursue undergraduate coursework in the same academic areas that spawned student interest in the EU program in the first place. Eleven faculty specifically cited International

⁴ Direct Quotation, Peter Loedel, Ph.D., West Chester University, in response to: "Have your students been pleased with the quality of the EU simulation experience (particular aspects and in general)? Please explain." in January 1999 Survey Concerning The European American Institute/Pennsylvania-Maryland Consortium European Union Simulation Program.

Relations, eight cited Comparative Politics, six cited European History, and seven cited European Politics as areas in which students took classes subsequent to the simulation. Other areas that were also identified in the survey at least once are International Organizations, Economics, and Modern Languages and Culture. Three EU alumnae from the University of Scranton, who were also part of Scranton's Honors Program, subsequently took specific Honors Tutorials with this author: one on European Monetary Union (which developed into an Honors Thesis project); one on Expansion and Enlargement of the EU in Eastern Europe (which will also become an Honors Thesis project); and, one on War and Peace in the 20th Century, which necessarily addressed a series of European political, economic, and social issues.

Most faculty respondents also said that numerous program alumni have chosen to continue their educations at the graduate level. Eleven cited law school (with four indicating International Law and one indicating European Union Law), six cited business school (with three indicating International Business), and 10 cited M.A./Ph.D. programs (with three indicating European Politics and two indicating European History) as the types of post-baccalaureate programs that their EU students tended to choose. In addition, one particular Lafayette College student has enrolled in a Masters in International Business Administration program, while another entered Georgetown's M.A. in German Studies program. While few students are in specific programs on the European Union, many are using the kinds of skills and academic training that the EU program naturally fosters. There are, however, a couple notable exceptions to this norm. One specific Franklin & Marshall participant has gone on to pursue a M.A. in European Union Studies at the University of Pittsburgh. Furthermore, a University of Scranton alumna from the 1997 simulation is currently enrolled in a Masters program in European Economic and Public Affairs

at University College Dublin, a perfect place for an Irish student with a special interest in the European Union.⁵

Five faculty specifically noted that student participants have been equally successful in using the EU simulation experience as a résumé builder as well as an internship and job interview topic. Several faculty provided great specific examples of how their student have translated the EU simulation experience into practical opportunities in the internship and job market. For example, Millersville students have used this fact to gain internships and jobs with businesses in European countries or in private-sector jobs that deal in the European context, in the State Department and the International Law Institute, and on the editorial staff of a European-related journal; West Chester students have used it to obtain internships at the Treasury and Defense Departments. One Susquehanna student went on to intern with International Student Services in Princeton, NJ, while another joined the Peace Corps in eastern Europe.

Franklin & Marshall actually has had one student intern specifically with the EU Commission in Washington, DC, and another has interned for a Member of the European Parliament while on a study abroad program in Brussels. Lafayette students have also obtained internships with EU Commission, with EU offices in Spain, and with the German Foreign Ministry in Bonn; two others have respective jobs with a New York City international public relations firm, and a Washington, D.C., consulting firm that assists American companies that are doing business in Europe. One Gettysburg student went into the family business that was

⁵ Subsequent to the completion of the survey, a Millersville student was chosen for the 1999 Pennsylvania/Maryland Consortium summer internship with the EU Commission in Washington, D.C., prior to her Fall 1999 enrollment at the University of Pittsburgh Graduate School for Public and International Affairs where she will continue her EU studies. The University of Pittsburgh is one of 10 European Union Centers in the United States.

opening a branch in the Netherlands, another has recently organized a special conference on the EURO for the Delaware World Trade Center, and yet another has recently been hired as a legislative assistant for foreign affairs by a member of the U.S. House of Representatives. One University of Scranton student specifically discussed her role in the Council of Ministers on an interview with Goldman Sachs, where she is now gainfully employed, while another used his experience as the Prime Minister of Sweden to become one of the Atlantic Council of the United States delegates to the 1998 Danish Atlantic Youth Seminar. He has subsequently been hired as a research assistant with the Foreign Policy Research Institute in Philadelphia, PA, where he continues to pursue his interests in International and Comparative Politics.

Clearly, some of these internship and job opportunities are indirect results of the EU simulation experience, while others are directly connected to students' participation. All, however, are specifically due to interests that were sparked or strengthened by student involvement in the EU program, and, in virtually all of these cases, students are again using the academic background and skills that were refined and enhanced by their participation. Millersville's Dr. Kirsten Bookmiller particularly noted that the experience in diplomatic and political bargaining as well as the visits to various diplomatic agencies were often general factors that either spurred students further into this arena or confirmed that students should avoid academic or employment opportunities that necessarily involved bargaining processes.

The Faculty

The job of faculty advisor in the European Union simulation program is an enormous challenge and huge undertaking; it involves not only academic preparation of one's self and one's students (which must be updated constantly), but administrative details that have the potential to

turn into a nightmare on any given day. While it is great to see that this program continues to grow from year to year, it is even more amazing to see that new faculty are recruited to the program and many of same faculty keeping bringing new students each year--despite the pressures that are inherent to the faculty advisor's role. Moreover, all of the faculty respondents said that they continue to alter their students' preparation, based on their own as well as student evaluations, in order to maintain the level of satisfaction by students and faculty member alike. By doing so, faculty are, either consciously or subconsciously, helping to ensure the ongoing value of this educational venture as well by striving for improvement in this learning process.

In fact, listening to student evaluations (whether formal or informal) is a consistent activity of the faculty after each year's simulation. This occurs despite the fact that all faculty said that their students have always been pleased with the simulation experience in general, and all but one said that students have been comfortable with their preparation in general. Six schools specifically said that students asked for greater preparation in parliamentary rules and procedures; as one faculty member aptly pointed out, students "become frustrated when matters [get bogged] down in a discussion of parliamentary technicalities."⁶ Three faculty cited preparation of Parliamentary alter-egos as a specific areas where student suggested greater preparation, one respondent mentioned that students wanted greater detail on the member nation that they were representing, and one other identified that the resolution issue itself as an area for more detailed preparation. Three other faculty stated that their students returned from the simulation being

⁶ Direct Quotation, Patricia N. Derr, Ph.D., Kutztown University, in response to: "Post-simulation, have your students been comfortable with the level of their preparation? Please explain." in January 1999 Survey Concerning The European American Institute/Pennsylvania-Maryland Consortium European Union Simulation Program.

amazed at their level of preparation, particularly because they feared ahead of time that they would not be prepared--or had even complained about their workloads--prior to the trip to Washington. Four faculty also suggested that while some of their students were very comfortable about the level of their own preparation, students were disappointed by the unevenness in the preparation--and even a perceived lack of seriousness--among other delegations.

When one considers the range of these specific comments, it is not a surprise to learn that faculty have consistently made adjustments to institutions' preparatory processes. Changes have been made in lectures, readings, debates and discussions, class assignments, and the ordering and time allotments for specific topics (ie., party groupings, alter-egos, country studies, resolution issue, parliamentary procedures). Hood College, in particular, has undertaken a more radical change: it will move preparation from a one-credit special topics course to a three-credit European Politics class; York College is also in the process of reevaluating its overall approach to student preparation. Furthermore, the newly-formed Executive Committee of the Pennsylvania/Maryland Consortium is redrafting an outdated Code of Parliamentary Procedures to help facilitate an improvement in student preparation and understanding in this regard. It also plans to revisit the question of a common reading list for all student participants, with the goal of alleviating faculty and student concerns about the impact of imbalances in institutional preparatory processes.

Just as the EU simulation program has precipitated a range of educational and career choices among student alumni, so too have several EU faculty pursued new professional activities as a result of their involvement with the simulation. Both York's Robert Terry and Muhlenberg's Patricia McRae have subsequently incorporated European Union components into their respective

International Relations and International Political Economy classes. Susquehanna's James Blessing has literally put together a new European Union course, while Hood's Joseph Dahms has developed a special course on the European Economy; moreover, Joe Dahms's recent sabbatical was in Strasbourg, France--one of the homes of the EU Parliament. Both Millersville's Kirsten Bookmiller and this author agree that our backgrounds in the EU have strengthen our capacity to teach in other areas of International Relations, such as International Organizations. This particular author has also subsequently developed a course on West European Politics, Honors Program tutorials on EU-related issues, and directed a senior Honors Thesis on European Monetary Union.

Furthermore, members of this ECSA Conference Panel (Lynchburg's Edward DeClair, West Chester's Peter Loedel, and this author) and Millersville's Kirsten Bookmiller have all addressed aspects of the EU simulation experience at previous academic conferences, and they have been working together to develop formal pieces for appropriate professional publications (such as a recent co-authored article in the ECSA Review). The development of a broader study on pedagogy that includes data from two other major EU simulations programs is also in its early stages. Additionally, Peter Loedel successfully applied for a grant through ECSA to facilitate several activities associated with his EU preparatory course and the simulation, including the production of a video. Finally, this author continues to collect materials for a possible article on the future of the European neutrals--a process that has been accelerated and bolstered by the fact that her students have represented Sweden and Austria in previous EU simulations.

When one knows and understands the exciting dynamics of the Pennsylvania/Maryland European Union simulation program, one should not be surprised that each year it continues to

attract and engage a new group of energetic, active, and vocal student participants and subsequently propels them into related educational and professional adventures. Yet, it is also important to remember that these students are consistently prepared and guided by an equally committed group of faculty advisors. What might be somewhat more surprising is the fact that eight of 13 faculty respondents have linked additional elements in their professional careers directly to their involvement in the EU simulation program. This latter point also speaks volumes about the impact and value of this program for all of its potential participants.

APPENDIX A

The following is a list of Faculty Advisors from the Pennsylvania/Maryland Consortium on the European Union who completed a survey for this study, and the institutions with which each is affiliated:

Kerry H. Whiteside, Ph.D.	Franklin & Marshall College
Joseph E. Dahms, Ph.D.	Hood College
Douglas Lea, Ph.D.	Kutztown University
Patricia N. Derr, Ph.D.	Kutztown University
Rado Pribic, Ph.D.	Lafayette College
Edward DeClair, Ph.D.	Lynchburg College *
Kirsten N. Bookmiller, Ph.D.	Millersville University
Patricia B. McRae, Ph.D.	Muhlenberg College
Donald F. Mayer, Jr., Ph.D.	Shippensburg University
James A. Blessing, Ph.D.	Susquehanna University
Gretchen J. Van Dyke, Ph.D.	University of Scranton
Peter Loedel, Ph.D.	West Chester University
Robert H. Terry, Ph.D.	York College

* Dr. DeClair also completed the survey for Gettysburg College, whose students he prepared for the simulation from 1993-98.

APPENDIX B

**Survey Concerning
The European American Institute/Pennsylvania-Maryland Consortium
European Union Simulation Program**

Please return to Dr. Gretchen J. Van Dyke by Friday, January 22, 1999.

**Dr. Gretchen J. Van Dyke
Department of Political Science
University of Scranton
Scranton, PA 18510
Phone: (570) 941-4307
FAX: (570) 941-4201
Email: Vandykeg1@tiger.uofs.edu**

Thank you again for your cooperation in this matter!

INSTRUCTIONS

- * Please complete all of the following questions as completely and honestly as possible.**
- * Please use the back of the page, or additional sheets, if you need additional space, particularly for Questions 10-15.**
- * Please be sure to answer Question #16, concerning the use of your name in my paper.**
- * If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.**

Name _____

Phone Number _____
(for further questions or clarification)

School _____

1. How many years has your school participated in the program? _____

2. Approximately how many students from your school have participated
each year? _____

total? _____

3. How are your students chosen for the EU program? (check as many as apply)

- _____ Special application for specific European Union class
- _____ Open enrollment for specific European Union class
- _____ Open enrollment for general International Relations class, with special section on the EU
- _____ Open enrollment for European History or European Politics class, with special section on the EU
- _____ Open enrollment for special college-wide European Affairs/European Union Club
- _____ Other -- Please explain: _____

4. What typically is the major of the students that you prepare for this program? (check as many as apply)

- _____ Political Science
- _____ History
- _____ International Studies
- _____ Modern Languages -- Please specify: _____
- _____ International Business
- _____ Other -- Please specify: _____

5. Have you had any foreign students participate in the program? _____

If yes, approximately how many? _____

From what countries? _____

6. What generally attracts your students to the EU program? (check as many as apply)

- _____ Major/Minor requirement
- _____ Interest in International Relations
- _____ Interest in Comparative Politics
- _____ Interest in European Politics/History
- _____ Other -- Please specify: _____

7. Prior to their participation in the EU program, have your students taken other courses in (check as many as apply)

- International Relations?
 Comparative Politics?
 European History?
 European Politics?
 Other related classes -- Please specify: _____
-

8. Subsequent to their participation in the EU program, have your students taken other courses in (check as many as apply)

- International Relations?
 Comparative Politics?
 European History?
 European Politics?
 Other related classes -- Please specify: _____
-

9. What kinds of graduate programs have your EU program students pursued? (check as many as apply)

- a. Law School International Law European Union Law
b. MBA International Business
c. MA/Ph.D European Politics European History
d. Other -- Please explain:

10. Have any of your EU program students received post-simulation internships that are directly related to their involvement in the EU program? If yes, please explain.

11. Have any of your EU program students pursued particular job opportunities that are directly related to their involvement in the EU program? If yes, please explain.

12. Do you do a formal assessment of the EU simulation program each year? Please explain.

13a. What do you do to prepare your students for the EU simulation experience? Please explain.

b. Post-simulation, have your students been comfortable with the level of their preparation? Please explain.

c. Are there changes that you have made in student preparation in response to students' evaluations of the program? Please explain.

14. Have your students been pleased with the quality of the EU simulation experience (particular aspects and in general)? Please explain.

15. Have you pursued any particular professional activities (new courses, research/scholarship, conferences, seminars, etc.) as a direct result of your involvement in the European Union simulation program? Please give specific details.

16. May I use your name specifically as I use the results of this survey in my conference paper? _____
If no, I will make every effort to ensure that you and your institution are not identifiable in the reporting of this data.