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The Asia Institute

The Asia Institute was founded in 2006 by connecting the four key sectors of society (private, public, not-for-profit and education) through a partnership network with a mission to build the leading education platform connecting Asia with the rest of the world. In 2014, the Asia Institute was named the Innovative New Program – Study Abroad Award Winner at the NAFSA Conference & Expo.

Over the past nine years, the Asia Institute has developed a successful history of delivering short-term faculty-led programs for multiple university partners, having worked with over 1750 students and faculty in China, Hong Kong SAR, South Korea, Japan, Vietnam, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand and India. The Asia Institute has quickly become a leading host partner for many educational institutions in areas such as short-term programs, student recruitment, experiential learning, faculty exchange, and career development.

Report Introduction

Asia is home to an estimated 4.3 billion people (roughly 60 percent of the world’s total population), however growth for study abroad in the region continues to increase only gradually. Between 2012 to 2014, the Institute of International Education’s Open Doors Report data shows the number of U.S. university students traveling to Asia has increased by a mere 1.2 percent.

During this same period, the number of short-term faculty-led programs has continued to increase, while participation in longer, more traditional forms of study abroad decline. As of 2015, the Open Doors Report estimates that 62 percent of all study abroad programs are now short-term programs, defined as international experiences with a duration of eight weeks or less. In Asia, the percentage of study abroad programming of a similar duration is even higher, due in part to perceptions of differing cultures, languages and truly immersive opportunities.

With Asia’s growing importance in the world, and students increasing preference for shorter format study abroad options, the Asia Institute’s 2016 Asia Short-Term Programs Report takes a unique and important look at international education. In 2016, the report’s in-depth analysis includes over 600 short-term programs as well as the first survey of short-term program faculty leaders.

Before we begin, a special thank you is due to Leslie Shen, Marketing Research Intern, Aki Sun, Marketing Research Intern and Eva Li, Marketing Manager for their hard work and contributions to the Asia Institute’s 2016 Asia Short-Term Programs Report.
Key Findings

The Asia Institute’s 2016 Asia Short-Term Programs Report is an in-depth look at 632 short-term faculty-led programs developed in Asia in 2016. The key findings of this report highlight three important trends:

• In 2016, China, Japan and India remained the most popular destinations for short-term programs in Asia. However, short-term programs in China continue to decline year over year, by 6.2 percent from 2015 to 2016.

• Between 2014 to 2016, short-term programs with a length of less than two weeks continued to decrease. Short-term programs with a length of over four weeks increased during the same period.

• Nearly 79 percent of faculty leader respondents acknowledged that recruiting students was their largest challenge when developing their short-term program. 36.2 percent also noted that they led their programs with less than 10 students.

Other Findings

In addition, the Asia Institute’s 2016 Asia Short-Term Programs Report examines a number of areas, which are important to the international education field:

Program Cost
The average on-the-ground cost for faculty-led programs in Asia was $155 per day. When considering short-term program costs where tuition was included, but international airfare was removed, this figure has increased by roughly 50 percent from 2014.

Program Disciplines
39 percent of programs in Asia were related to arts and science majors. 21 percent were business programs. 17 percent were engineering disciplines. Compared to 2015, arts and science and engineering programs increased slightly while business programs continue to decrease from 25 percent in 2014 to 21 percent in 2016.

Program Operations
Study abroad and global program operations continue to become more centralized. In 2016, 56 percent of short-term program operations were centralized, while 44 percent were decentralized. This compares to 53 percent and 47 percent in 2015.

Program Collaboration
While study abroad and global program operations become more centralized, 29.2 percent of faculty leaders note that working with their university or college offices, including the Study Abroad Offices, Legal Council etc. was a significant challenge to setup their short-term program.
1. Research Design

The research design used for the 2016 Asia Short-Term Programs Report is predominantly centered around publically available records for short-term faculty-led programs developed in Asia in 2016. Emphasis is given to known and identifiable quantitative data.

2. Data Collection

The 2016 Asia Short-Term Programs Report relies on data collected from over 600 short-term faculty-led programs developed in Asia in 2016. All program data used is primary. The program data included is not solely from short-term faculty-led programs hosted by the Asia Institute nor solely from Asia Institute partner universities. Rather, the program data represents 207 different U.S. universities and colleges.

Based on a predetermined set of questions, the initial data was pulled from identified short-term faculty-led programs. The data was reviewed for accuracy and adherence to specified parameters. Not all program records are complete, due to the availability of information. Program records, where the data was insufficient for the core criteria, were removed. Supplemental primary online sources were utilized to add to incomplete program records.

In addition, for the first time, the 2016 Asia Short-Term Programs Report includes survey responses received from 90 faculty leaders who developed or led short-term programs in Asia in 2015 and/or 2016. The survey responses are reported in aggregate, and taken directly from ten questions provided to 1200 short-term program faculty leaders.

3. Data Analysis

The 2016 Asia Short-Term Programs Report data analysis assigned parameters and categories for each criteria assessed. During the analysis, all program data records were sorted into 39 individual criteria including, for example, university name, program theme, destination country etc. Once compiled, cross-tabulation analysis was conducted, considering different program durations, countries, and program inclusions or exclusions. The final results were then compared with the findings from 2014 and 2015.

4. Data Comparison

The findings from the 2016 Asia Short-Term Programs Report were compared with the 606 short-term faculty-led program data records collected in 2015. This year’s report includes a comparative analysis of these findings. This comparative analysis identifies potential trends for short-term faculty-led programs developed in Asia, as well as the international education field more broadly.
Research Analysis

Annually, the Asia Institute meets with hundreds of Study Abroad and Global Program Directors and Managers, Deans, Associate Deans and Faculty, to assess their changing needs in international education. The findings of the 2016 Asia Short-Term Programs Report are based on established questions, which international educators have identified as key factors pertaining to short-term faculty-led programs around the globe.

In addition, the Asia Institute’s 2016 Asia Short-Term Programs Report has sought out and incorporated the critical viewpoints of faculty leaders who bring students to Asia on short-term programs. Some of the questions posed to faculty leaders were:

- What are Students Studying?
- How are Short-Term Programs Operated?
- How are Short-Term Programs Designed?
- Where are Programs Going?
- What is the Average Duration for Programs in Asia?
- What Months have the Highest Number of Programs?
- What is the Average Program Fee for a Program?
- What are the Fees for Different Countries and Durations?
- What do Short-Term Programs Include?

- If you worked with a local university or provider for your program, did you encounter any challenges?
- Did your students interact with local university students during your program?
- Did your program have university funding or scholarships available for students?
What are Students Studying in Asia?

*All program records were reviewed.*

In 2016, 39 percent of short-term faculty-led programs developed in Asia were developed for College of Arts and Science related majors. Programs which were related to Business and Engineering were 21 percent and 17 percent respectively.

Programs categorized as “Other” include short-term programs related to Music, Health and Medicine, Education and Development, Media and Communications, Law, and Bioenvironmental Sciences (including biotechnology and food science).

Between 2014 to 2016, College of Arts and Science programs remain the leading focus for short-term programs developed in Asia. The percentage of programs offered has increased year over year, from 35 percent in 2014 to 39 percent in 2016. Meanwhile, short-term College of Business programs have continued to decline over the past three years, from 25 percent in 2014 to 21 percent in 2016.

Highlighted Programs

**Program Focus:** Business, Asian Studies  
**Country:** China  
**University:** Pace University  
This program is designed to allow students to examine the symbiosis between Confucian-Communist ethics and economic and financial development in a variety of urban settings. The program will investigate the historical origins of diverse entrepreneurial norms and practices in these urban settings, the secrets of their success, the challenges and limits ahead, and the implications of their newly found political and economic power. Exploring economic models, social structures, and diverse historical experiences is a key to better understanding today’s China and its rapid rise as a global economic power.

**Program Focus:** Anthropology  
**Country:** Indonesia  
**University:** Drexel University  
This program offers a 10-day experience in Indonesia, where students will encounter very different models of the city from those encountered in class and experience for themselves how culturally determined “the streets” — as both an idea and a material structure organizing urban life — really are. As the world’s largest Muslim country, Indonesia is a fascinating place to examine the continual emergence of urban culture. Students will explore the streets, malls, food stalls, impromptu concerts, luxurious high rises, and makeshift shelters that constitute contemporary Indonesian urban culture and gain a ground-level understanding of anthropological practice.
How are Short-Term Programs Operated?

* Of the 632 total program records, 606 program records were reviewed.

In 2016, 14 percent of short-term faculty-led programs in Asia were operated with a university partner, while 86 percent of short-term programs were operated by a faculty leader themselves, the study abroad office, a travel agent or a third party provider.

The 2016 Asia Short-Term Program Faculty Survey showed that 12.4 percent of short-term programs in Asia were setup by a faculty leader and a local university, which is consistent with the research findings. 43.8 percent of Asia short-term programs were setup independently by a faculty member or with a colleague. 25.8 percent of short-term programs were setup by the faculty leader cooperating with the Study Abroad Office.

The survey of faculty leaders further asked about the challenges faced when setting up a program. 29.2 percent of faculty leaders consider working with university/college offices, including the study abroad office and legal counsel as a challenge.

How are Short-Term Programs Designed?

* Of the 632 total program records, 608 program records were reviewed.

In 2016, the same assessment criteria from the 2015 Asia Short-Term Programs Report was utilized. It was found that 56 percent of short-term faculty-led programs in Asia were operated under centralized processes, while 44 percent of short-term programs were operated under decentralized models.

From the data, study abroad and global program operations are becoming more centralized, and it is clear that Study Abroad and Global Programs Offices are now more involved in pre-departure operations and preparation, when compared to 2015 or earlier.

Highlighted Programs

**Program Focus:** Disaster Management, Asian Studies  
**Country:** Japan, Nepal  
**Universities:** Dickinson College, Arizona State University  
This program will allow students to learn about how the local community responds to coastal flooding, nuclear accidents and earthquakes when they occur in Asia. In addition, students will understand how to reduce a community’s vulnerability to disasters. Lastly, the program will allow students to compare the resiliency of communities involved.

**Program Focus:** Cyber Intelligence, Socio-Cultural Issues, International Terrorism  
**Country:** Singapore  
**University:** James Madison University  
This program will allow participants to enhance their understanding of religious, socio-cultural, economic, political, and geographic aspects of contemporary issues such as international terrorism and cyber security. The program will also include a research project focusing on counter-terrorism or a related topic.
Where are Programs Going?

*All program records were reviewed.*

In 2016, the most popular destination countries for short-term faculty-led programs were China, Japan and India. China remained the leading destination, however the analysis in 2016 clearly shows a decline of 6.2 percent compared with 2015. Short-term programs in Asia were increasingly focused on Japan, with faculty-led programs in Japan surpassing India (when considering the total number of programs offered in 2016). In 2016, South Korea increased year-over-year for the number of short-term faculty-led programs offered. Programs in Vietnam, Thailand and Singapore also increased.

Similar findings were found in the 2016 Asia Short-Term Program Report Faculty Survey, where nearly 65 percent of faculty leaders who responded have decided to lead a program in Asia during the 2017 academic year. 29.2 percent of the respondents noted they will develop a program in China, followed by 16.9 percent in Japan and 15.4 percent in India.

**Highlighted Programs**

**Program Focus:** Japanese Law  
**Country:** Japan  
**University:** Mitchell Hamline School of Law  
This program offers a 10-day experience in Japan. Students will have a better understanding of the legal system in Japan as compared to the U.S. Common Law System. While in Japan, students will visit the Supreme Court, meet with law firms, and legal representatives in Tokyo. Along with these visits, students will also experience the culture and traditions of Japan.

**Program Focus:** Biological Science  
**Country:** Thailand  
**University:** University of Arkansas  
This program is based at the Sakaerat Environmental Research Station in Northeastern Thailand, where students will receive instruction through classroom lectures and field trips as well as participate in field or laboratory-based research with Thai undergraduate students. Students will also have the opportunity to learn basic Thai language and aspects of Thai culture.
Where are Programs Going?

* All program records were reviewed.

The most popular destination cities for short-term programs in China remained the urban centers of Beijing and Shanghai, however, the growth rate in these two cities significantly slowed. Meanwhile, there was also a noticeable decline in Hong Kong SAR.

By contrast, new cities that were previously underrepresented did show an increase, pointing to an expansion of geographic distribution. In 2016, Japan and India showed a similar trend, with visits to lesser represented destinations. For South Korea, Vietnam and Thailand, their capital cities of Seoul, Hanoi and Bangkok remained the most popular destinations.

New Program Destinations in 2016
- Deyang
- Huhhot
- Guiyang
- Kamakura
- Nagasaki
- Kanazawa
- Hardiwar
- Rishikesh
- Alleppey

The 2016 Asia Short-Term Programs Report findings show a continual increase in the development of multi-country comparatives. Multi-country program models increased from 5.6 percent of all programs in 2015, to 7.5 percent in 2016. Some common multi-country comparative examples include:
- Japan and South Korea, China and Japan, China and South Korea, and Thailand, Singapore and Malaysia
What is the Average Duration for Programs in Asia?

* Of the 632 total program records, 573 program records were reviewed.

According to the standard definition, short-term education programs are international experiences that are eight weeks or less. In the Asia Short-Term Programs Report, program durations are further broken down into six distinct program lengths.

In 2016, the average duration of short-term programs in Asia was 22 days. This was two days shorter than the average in 2015. Interestingly however, between 2014 to 2016, the percentage of programs that were less than four weeks decreased, while programs that were four to eight weeks in length increased. Short-term programs with a length of four to five weeks increased by 8.3 percent during this time period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Two Weeks or Less</th>
<th>Two to Three Weeks</th>
<th>Three to Four Weeks</th>
<th>Four to Five Weeks</th>
<th>Five to Six Weeks</th>
<th>Six Weeks or More</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Duration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>22 Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>22 Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>24 Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>22 Days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What Months have the Highest Number of Programs?

* Of the 632 total program records, 544 program records were reviewed.

In 2016, the preferred months for short-term faculty-led programs remained consistent with the findings from 2015. May led the list with 47 percent of all programs. June and July were the second and third preferred months at 18 percent and 11 percent respectively. The analysis also showed an increase of 2 percent in August, a trend to watch, as short-term programs identify non-traditional times of year to travel.

The 2016 Asia Short-Term Program Report Faculty Survey highlights a major challenge for faculty leaders, which is student recruiting. An overwhelming 78.7 percent of faculty leaders noted this was their most significant challenge to setup their short-term program. As 47 percent of all short-term programs in Asia are in May, the month selected for the program may be one reason, due to the competition faced.
What is the Average Program Fee for a Program?

* Of the 632 total program records, 545 program records were reviewed.

Study abroad program fees are a key factor, which influence a student's decision on whether to participate. The 2016 Asia Short-Term Programs Report breaks down short-term program fees to analyze both the average program fee per day, as well as two key cost factors, international airfare and tuition. In addition, the 2016 Asia Short-Term Programs Report compares data collected regarding short-term program fees from 2014 to 2016.

From the analysis, it is clear that short-term program fees in Asia continue to rise. A major component is tuition fees, which have increased dramatically between 2014 to 2016. When short-term programs include both international airfare and tuition were compared to programs where tuition was removed, program fees per day actually decreased by 31 percent. When considering short-term programs where tuition is included and international airfare is removed, the increase in program fees is remarkable, rising by 50 percent on average since 2014.

In the 2016 Asia Short-Term Program Faculty Survey, faculty leaders were asked about their most important considerations when developing a short-term program. From the responses received, 52.8 percent of faculty leaders noted that student program fees are one of the most important considerations.

Additionally, 76.4 percent of faculty leaders noted that scholarships or university funding was available to students on their program. 23.6 percent of short-term programs did not have scholarships or funding available to students.
What are the Fees for Different Countries and Durations?

* Of the 632 total program records, 403 program records were reviewed.

The 2016 Asia Short-Term Programs Report compares the average short-term program fees for the top three destinations. These findings consider the impact of program duration on the total program fees, and can be used as a benchmark for Study Abroad and Global Program Offices to assess similar short-term faculty-led programs developed.

Please Note: The included program fees may or may not include international airfare and/or tuition.

What do Short-Term Programs Include?

* Of the 632 total program records, 403 program records were reviewed.

To further understand the design of short-term faculty-led programs in Asia, the 2016 Asia Short-Term Programs Report also considers various program inclusions, for example the type of accommodations utilized and how many meals were included in the program fees.

In 2016, dorm facilities were utilized in 49 percent of programs, a slight increase from 2015. Hostels/hotels decreased by 4 percent from the year prior, and were utilized in 41 percent of short-term programs. Meanwhile, the percent of homestays remained the same.

In 2016, 30 percent of short-term programs did not include meals. This represents a 21 percent year-over-year increase from 2015. Roughly 42 percent of programs included “some” meals, which was a 26 percent decline from 2015.

As short-term programs in Asia increase in length and the program fees rise due to higher tuition, faculty leaders and institutions are consciously identifying ways to lower the total program fees. This currently includes the utilization of university dorm facilities and removing included program meals.
2016 Asia Short-Term Program Faculty Survey

An important component of any short-term program is the faculty leader(s), who dedicate their time to student learning in an international setting. To better understand how faculty leaders are developing their short-term programs, the Asia Institute launched a new faculty leader survey in 2016. Ten questions were posed to faculty leaders who developed short-term programs in Asia between 2015 and 2016. The analysis provided is based on the aggregated responses received from 90 respondents.

Q1: How many students enrolled?

From the data collected, 31.9 percent of programs had six to ten students. 29.8 percent of programs had 16-20 students. 25.5 percent of programs had 11-15 students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2: How was your program setup?

When considering the operating model, 43.8 percent of programs were setup independently by a faculty leader. 25.8 percent of programs were setup with the Study Abroad Office. Only 11.2 percent were setup with a provider.

Q3: When setting up your program, did you encounter any of the following challenges?

From the responses received, it is clear that student recruiting is a major hurdle across short-term programming. 78.7 percent of faculty leaders acknowledged this was the largest challenge faced for building their short-term program. “Setting up logistics” was also identified as a challenge, which stands out when considering that the majority of short-term programs were setup independently by faculty leaders and their colleagues.

- Recruiting Students: 78.7%
- Setting up logistics including hotels, transportation etc.: 29.2%
- Working with your university or college offices, including the Study Abroad Office etc.: 29.2%
- Managing the budget and finances for the program: 27.0%
Q4: If you worked with a host partner, did you encounter any challenges?

For faculty leaders who worked with a local university or provider, the specific challenges faced were also assessed. The highest ranked challenge was the program fees for students, with 13.5 percent of respondents voicing this concern. “Pre-Departure Communication” was also highly ranked, as 11.2 percent of faculty leaders noted this challenge.

Q5: Did alumni from your university or college interact with students during your program?

Of the faculty leaders who responded, 36 percent noted that one alum or more was involved in their short-term program. 64 percent of short-term programs did not have an alum included, indicating an opportunity for future short-term program development.

Q6: Did your students interact with local university students during your program?

Peer-to-peer student engagement is another area considered. 80 percent of respondents noted that their students engaged with local university students, at some point during their short-term program in Asia. 20 percent of short-term programs did not involve local students.
How can we recruit more students to study abroad on short-term programs?

With 90 faculty leaders responding to the Asia Institute’s 2016 Asia Short-Term Program Faculty Survey, and 78.7 percent stating student recruiting is their number one challenge, this figure simply cannot be overlooked. Universities and colleges developing short-term programs must consider how best to engage students in global learning opportunities, and one area of emphasis must be the educational institutions broader goals and strategy for global initiatives. By simply creating a platform and process for faculty to propose their short-term program courses, without such a comprehensive strategy and framework, are universities and colleges actually limiting their development of global learning?

Does having faculty leaders oversee all aspects of program management ensure affordability for students?

In 2016, the topic of ensuring short-term program affordability continues to be a key point of concern. With tuition fees rising, the pressure to keep program fees low is passed along to either faculty leaders managing their own programs or on-the-ground operators and providers. In addition to this responsibility, faculty are also tasked with student recruitment, the number one acknowledged challenge. As a faculty member’s key responsibility is teaching, content development and learning outcomes, does having faculty oversee student recruiting and program management actually limit the number of students who study abroad, and make programs more expensive?

How can short-term learning experiences be more impactful and engaging for students?

To develop sustainable short-term programs in Asia, students must feel engaged. This importantly occurs in many facets of the overseas experience, such as general global and cultural awareness, self-awareness and reflection, and involvement with the local community. With that said, are educational institutions and faculty-leaders maximizing the short-term learning outcomes, as well as engagement for students, by integrating experiential learning models?

How can we foster integration and collaboration as more institutions become centralized?

Interestingly, nearly 30 percent of the Asia Institute’s 2016 Asia Short-Term Program Faculty Survey respondents noted that “working with your university/college offices, including study abroad, legal etc.” was a challenge when developing a short-term program. At the same time, universities and colleges are becoming more centralized in their operations. These two key findings, point to a need for increased integration and collaboration, when developing global learning opportunities. Without such collaboration, both the institution itself and the students enrolled, will be limited by the system that is seeking to ensure a high level of learning is achieved.

Summary and Trends

As study abroad continues to expand for U.S. educational institutions, Asia will play an increasingly important role. The Asia Institute’s 2016 Asia Short-Term Programs Report provides a perspective on the largest segment of study abroad, namely short-term faculty-led programs, with a unique vantage point incorporating the various contributors to short-term programs, both Study Abroad and Global Program administrators and faculty leaders. The key findings highlight trends to watch, as study abroad continues to evolve.
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Ancient Cures

This immersive educational program enables students to transform their way of thinking and living through participation in various forms of yoga and naturopathic therapy in India. In addition, students will visit historical sites and communities, providing a broader understanding of India today.

Islamic Banking

This program enables students to understand the current development of Islamic banking and finance in Southeast Asia and how Islamic banking compares to conventional or Western banking systems, through onsite visits and meetings with leaders in the Islamic banking industry.

The Asia Institute has been named the #5 Study Abroad Provider in the Fifth Annual Study Abroad Rankings released by Abroad101. The rankings are determined by assessing the rating scores and positive reviews received from program participants.

The Asia Institute Named #5 Study Abroad Provider

The Asia Institute develops customized all-inclusive and/or flexible short-term programs for students at undergraduate, graduate, post-graduate and executive levels. To learn more, please visit our website: www.asiainstitute.org

Program Scholarships

To support students studying abroad in Asia, the Asia Institute is co-developing multiple scholarship programs, which are open to students studying at U.S. institutions. To learn more about the Asia Institute’s joint-scholarships, please visit our website.

Student Recruiting Support

The Asia Institute provides various forms of support to faculty leaders who are actively promoting and recruiting students for their short-term programs. The Asia Institute can provide program flyer/brochure/poster templates, presentation PPT templates, past program videos and more.

Alumni Event Support

Thousands of alumni from our university partners are located in Asia, and are interested in hosting or meeting with students. The Asia Institute utilizes an extensive network to support our U.S. educational partners with alumni events, including Life and Career Advice and Career Development.

Disabled Student Support

The Asia Institute is committed to ensuring a wonderful learning experience for all students, including those with special needs. Previously, we have hosted students with hearing impairments and physical disabilities making every effort to prepare for the specific support required.
The Asia Institute

**Philadelphia Office:**
768 S. 8th St., Philadelphia, PA 19147, U.S.A.

**Santa Fe Office:**
13 Embudo Del Sol, Santa Fe, NM 87508, U.S.A.

**Shanghai Office:**
E2, 18F, JuneYao International Plaza
789 Zhaojiabang Road, Shanghai, 200032, China

**Hangzhou Office:**
Room 327, Building 2, Zheshang Fortune Center
No.97 Gudun Road, Hangzhou, 310032, China

info@asiainstitute.org
www.asiainstitute.org