



Program Assessment Report (PAR)

International Studies (ISTU) Baccalaureate Degree

REPORT PREPARED by: Green, December

ACADEMIC YEAR COVERED BY THIS REPORT: [Academic Year]

I. PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

Graduates will be able to communicate effectively in writing (LO #1, assessed in 2019-20 and every other year). speak and write proficiently in a foreign language (LO #2, assessed in 2019-20 and every year). demonstrate an understanding of the value of diversity and multicultural competence in today's global environment (LO #3, to be assessed every other year starting in 2020-21).

II. PROCEDURES USED FOR ASSESSMENT

A. Direct Assessment

LO #1 (December 2019) Graduates will be able to communicate effectively in writing. In an appropriate upper level IS course (PLS 4720), students were assigned a paper that the SPIA Assessment Committee assessed in December 2019 with a rubric utilizing the following assessment strategies Assessment Strategy #1 "Uses appropriate and relevant content to explore ideas and shape the work." Assessment Strategy #2 "Cites sources consistently and properly." Assessment Strategy #3 "Uses language that conveys meaning to readers." The committee assessed all the papers written for that course that were submitted by IS majors. LO #2 (August and December 2019, April 2020) Graduates will speak and write proficiently in a foreign language. We identified each graduating IS senior's final (3000 or 4000-level) foreign language course and asked the instructor of that course to assess the student for proficiency. The Interagency Language Roundtable defines ILR1, "survival proficiency," as Assessment Strategy #1 "satisfies routine social demands and limited work requirements." Assessment Strategy #2 "handles elementary constructions accurately." Assessment Strategy #3 "speaks with an accent but is intelligible." It was difficult to obtain artifacts to support these findings because in many cases, by the time the students had applied to graduate, they had finished their language coursework. Instead, we relied on language faculty to report on each AS for each student based on grades for assignments collected in their gradebooks. Instructors

assessed the language proficiency of all IS majors graduating in AY 2019-20 (except those for whom English is a second language. Those students passed an English proficiency exam).

B. Scoring of Student Work

For both learning outcomes, the IS Assessment Committee used rubrics the IS director designed, based on expert sources (Association of American Colleges and Universities, Interagency Language Roundtable). For LO #1 "Graduates will be able to communicate effectively in writing." Members of the IS Assessment Committee employed a rubric utilizing the following assessment strategies (drawn from the AAUC's Written Communications rubric*) 1) "Uses appropriate and relevant content to explore ideas and shape the work," 2) "Sources are cited consistently and properly"; and 3) "Uses language that conveys meaning to readers with clarity." The IS director collected the data and members of the IS Assessment Committee analyzed it. *Rhodes, Terrel. "Assessing Outcomes and Improving Achievement Tips and Tools for Using Rubrics." Washington, DC Association of American Colleges and Universities. 2010. For LO #2 "Graduates will speak and write proficiently in a foreign language." The IS director asked the instructors of IS majors' final foreign language courses to assess the students' proficiency. We used a rubric drawn from the Interagency Language Roundtable, which defines ILR1, "survival proficiency," as Assessment Strategy #1 "Satisfies routine social demands and limited work requirements." Assessment Strategy #2 "Handles elementary constructions accurately." Assessment Strategy #3 "Speaks with an accent but is intelligible." It was difficult to obtain artifacts to support these findings because in many cases, by the time the students had applied to graduate, they had finished their language coursework. Instead, we relied on language faculty to report on each AS for each student based on the professor's notes and grades for assignments collected in their gradebooks.

C. Indirect Assessment

The IS Assessment Committee did not utilize an indirect assessment in 2019-2020 for IS, but will survey graduating IS seniors starting in December 2020, asking them to rate the degree to which they feel they have mastered the three learning outcomes. The program director sent out a general exit survey to all IS graduating seniors (attached to the last page of this report), but there were 0 responses.

III. ASSESSMENT RESULTS/INFORMATION:

For LO #1 "Uses appropriate and relevant content to explore ideas and shape the work" (AS #1). "Sources are cited consistently and properly" (AS #2). "Uses

language that conveys meaning to readers with clarity" (AS#3). For LO #2 "Satisfies routine social demands and limited work requirements" (AS #1). "Handles elementary constructions accurately" (AS #2). "Speaks with an accent but is intelligible" (AS #3).

For LO #1 100% of students achieved AS #1. 80% of students achieved AS #2. 100% of students achieved AS #3. For LO #2 100% of graduating seniors achieved AS #1. 100% of graduating seniors achieved AS #2. 100% of graduating seniors achieved AS #3.

For LO #1 all the papers assessed indicated that students are able to use appropriate and relevant content to explore ideas and shape the work. They are also using language that conveys meaning to readers with clarity. Most (80%) of the students cite sources consistently and properly, although this posed a problem for some (20%). For LO #2 all (100%) of the graduating seniors in IS were able to satisfy routine social demands and limited work requirements in a second language (AS#1). All were able to handle elementary constructions accurately in this language (AS#2). All of the students could speak intelligibly in the language, though with an accent (AS #3). Based on these assessments, some students could benefit from more work on citing sources consistently and properly. However, otherwise, it appears that IS is successfully meeting its learning outcomes.

IV. ACTIONS TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING

The program director will discuss the results of this year's report with the International Studies Committee. Because this is an interdisciplinary program that draws from across the university and is not housed in any single department, it is not possible to coordinate improvement plans ways that it is for traditional departments and disciplines. Perhaps the university could lead a broader effort at improvement by focusing on IW courses. This year's results are in line with those of previous years.

V. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Additional documentation, when provided, is stored in the internal Academic Program Assessment of Student Learning SharePoint site.