



## Program Assessment Report (PAR)

### International Studies (ISTU) Baccalaureate Degree

**REPORT PREPARED by:** Green, December

**ACADEMIC YEAR COVERED BY THIS REPORT:** 2020-2021

#### I. PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

Graduates will be able to...demonstrate an understanding of the value of diversity and multicultural competence in today's global environment (LO 2020-21). Graduates will be able to....speak and write proficiently in a foreign language (LO 2020-21). The following learning outcome has been and will be assessed other years Graduates will be able to....communicate effectively in writing (assessed in 2019-20 and every other year).

#### II. PROCEDURES USED FOR ASSESSMENT

##### A. Direct Assessment

LO #1 (2020-21) Graduates will be able to demonstrate an understanding of the value of diversity and multicultural competence in today's global environment. In an upper-level course that many IS majors take (PLS 4881), students were assigned a paper that the SPIA Assessment Committee assessed with a rubric utilizing the following assessment strategies Assessment Strategy #1 "Demonstrate an understanding of the complexity of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices," Assessment Strategy #2 "Interpret a political issue or event from more than one perspective." The committee assessed the papers written for that course that were submitted by IS majors (2). LO #2 (2020-21) 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 2020-21 (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 scored students' level of performance utilizing rubrics the IS director designed, based on expert sources (Association of American Colleges and Universities; Interagency Language Roundtable).<sup>\*</sup> For LO #1 "Graduates will be able to demonstrate an understanding of the value of diversity and multicultural competence in today's global environment." Assessment Strategy #1 "Demonstrate an understanding of the complexity of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices," Assessment Strategy #2 "Interpret a political issue or event from more than one perspective." The IS director collected the data and members of the IS Assessment Committee analyzed it. <sup>\*</sup>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 director sent out an anonymous Qualtrics survey to graduating IS seniors starting S21 asking them to rate the degree to which they feel they have mastered the three learning outcomes (see the last page of the report for the survey and results). The two respondents strongly agreed that IS is meeting its learning outcomes for LO #1 and #2. Respondents were divided over whether they felt they were proficient in another language.

## **III. ASSESSMENT RESULTS/INFORMATION:**

For LO #1 Assessment Strategy #1 "Demonstrate an understanding of the complexity of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices," Assessment Strategy #2 "Interpret a political issue or event from more than one perspective. 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. 100% of students achieved AS #2. 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 Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in a way that revives internationalization of the curriculum. 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.