**October 2010 Assessment Report Feedback–International Studies**

**Assessment Committee Contact**: Scott Hendrix, Academic Skills Center

*\*Note*: Assessment report/feedback was reviewed/provided by Vicki Baker, Mark Bollman, and Scott Hendrix

**NOTE**: Curiously, the May 2010 report follows a four-section format rather than the six-section format requested (and which was followed for fall 2009 IS report); this format makes the IS report somewhat difficult to review, since the information flow is different than expected (and also different from other program/department reports).

**Specific comments referring to NEW assessment report sections or information/data follow:**

**Section 2**: direct assessment discussion (p. 2-3)

“In Fall 2009, we began piloting direct assessment tools in INTN 130 to measure learning in that course. This present report contains our assessment findings for INTN 130 for Fall 2009.

We will begin piloting similar assessment instruments in INTN 370 during the Fall 2010 semester. At present, therefore, we do not have direct assessment data for this course.”

**Comments**

The INTN 130 [gateway course] data and discussion of data provides helpful, valuable information about student learning in the gateway course (during fall 2009); we look forward to reading your updated assessment report with data from fall 2010 added (including INTN 370 pilot data/discussion), and with further analysis of the student learning trends you are seeing within the IS program.

As discussed previously, the general framework of using the IS gateway and capstone courses as assessment sites makes good sense and provides a workable framing for assessing student learning outcomes within the IS program.

The INTN 130 assessment matrix (p. 3-4; plus discussion of matrix data in Section 3) provides especially helpful, easy to understand information and discussion about student learning outcomes in the IS gateway course.

**Section 3**: Assessment results for INTN 130 (p. 4-6)

The extensive discussion and analysis of assessment matrix data in Section 3—for Criteria A, B & C—is likewise quite helpful, and presents a clear and coherent glimpse of student learning in the IS gateway course.

As noted above, we look forward to reviewing future IS assessment reports with additional data sets added to the discussion and analysis of student learning in the IS program (and for both gateway and capstone courses).

INTN 370 senior questionnaires (p. 7) [9 students referred to in fall 2009 report?]

Senior responses are indirect measures of student learning, but do provide helpful program and planning information; using this type of survey also helps develop “culture of assessment” for both students and faculty in the IS major. (I.e., assessment comes to be seen as normalized and expected part of major, rather than externally imposed activity that happens only once in a while.)

**Section 4**

While the Conclusion (Section 4) provides helpful general discussion about the IS program and student learning within the program, more detailed discussion and application of the learning outcomes data, information and plans developed so far would be even more helpful (e.g., such as the final Recommendation section regarding development of “a practical tool that provides meaningful assessment data” for direct assessment of student learning in INTN 370, starting in the Fall 2010 semester).

As before, our thanks to IS faculty, students, and staff for the time, energy, and collaborative labor that went into assessment efforts within the program, including the drafting and revising of IS assessment reports.

Please contact your Assessment Committee liaison if you have follow-up questions, comments, or concerns.

**NOTE**: for your reference, fall 2009 Assessment Committee feedback is copied below.

**Fall 2009 International Studies Feedback**  
1. First, thanks for your diligence and extensive time working on the plan/report updates. Overall, the document is much easier to read now, and is considerably more effective in presenting IS student learning goals, along with the program components and methods or instruments used within the program to assess how students are doing in reaching the learning goals. Sticking with IS major assessment for the near future seems like a pragmatic decision that will simplify program assessment in both short and longer term.  
  
2. In general, the information, analysis, and commentary added for **Steps 5 & 6** is very helpful in providing a clearer sense of the evidence for student learning within the IS program, as well as details about how the program is using (and will use) information drawn from assessment tools and methods/measures for IS program conversations and curricular or program revisions.  
  
From the evidence presented here, it is clear that student learning happens within the program--and that those of you coordinating the program and faculty teaching courses in the program are working to assess the student learning as it happens.  
\*\*\*Your suggested plans for adapting the Mode course direct assessment for IS courses seem especially logical and helpful, given that many faculty will already be familiar with this model, procedures are in place for collecting and analyzing data, etc.  
  
Likewise, your longer term plans for both indirect and direct assessment seem smart and helpful--and should be fairly easy to implement, and will likely yield a reasonable amount of data and information for program analysis and discussion.  
  
3. For the current round of assessment, it would be helpful (especially for external audiences) if you would include \*some\* information from the INTN 370 senior surveys. Even though the number of such surveys is small (total of 9 students), and the results have only been collected for two semesters, specific data and comments from students do provide a useful base to build upon.   
\*\*\*Including selected student comments and data/responses to specific questions would also emphasize that the IS program highly values individual student comments and suggestions as part of program assessment efforts (as you note regarding IS program discussion about requiring economics courses, in Step 6).  
  
Otherwise, at this point, I don't have other specific suggestions or concerns for this round of assessment.