



## International Development (M.A.)

Department Website: <http://www1.sis.american.edu/academics/graduateprograms/ma/id.htm>

### 1. Learning Outcomes

*On completion of their MAID degree, we will assess students' ability to:*

- 1) Describe and distinguish among the major schools of thought in International Development and be able to apply these theories to explain International Development phenomena;**
- 2) Develop and execute research projects that integrate theory and empirical evidence and develop analytical skills.**
- 3) Attain a professional proficiency in the literature derived from their core and concentration courses.
- 4) Develop their writing and speaking skills so they can clearly and effectively convey their knowledge.
- 5) Show insightful understanding of basic concepts and methods in the field of International Development.
- 6) Speak, write, and read a foreign language.
- 7) Demonstrate an ability, appropriate to the level of economics courses taken, to use economic concepts to help explain to the dynamics of development, as also the limitations of those concepts.

## 2. Assessment Measures and Schedule

Learning Outcomes	Measures	Results	Schedule & Use of Information (for both outcomes )																																																						
<p><b>Outcome 1:</b> Describe and distinguish among the major schools of thought in International Development and be able to apply these theories to explain International Development phenomena</p>	<p><b>1 Direct Measure :</b> Faculty teaching courses in which major debates are inherent in the course e.g International Devt, will use research and term papers and class participation to estimate what number of student who truly stood out (= 'A+' (5), excelled (= A) (4 ), were confident and capable (=A-) (3), were not fully confident and were a little uncertain B+ (2), and those who were weak (= B or below)(1)</p> <p><b>Indirect Measure;</b> Student evaluation of their own learning in responses to the same question included in a student administered survey: Both 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> yr students are included because almost all have been through the ID survey course Score: 0 = not at all; 1 = poorly; 2 = Fairly well; 4 = well; 5 = very well</p>	<p>Direct 2009 We have a sample of three classes</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Score</th> <th>#</th> <th>%age</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>11</td> <td>13.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>33</td> <td>41.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>24</td> <td>30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>8</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Direct Spring 2010 (Three classes)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Score</th> <th>#</th> <th>%age</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>15</td> <td>21.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>25</td> <td>36.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>21</td> <td>30.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>8</td> <td>11.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Indirect 2010 Student measures</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Score</th> <th>#</th> <th>%age</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>7</td> <td>13.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>29</td> <td>55.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>15</td> <td>28.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>1.9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Score	#	%age	5	11	13.75	4	33	41.25	3	24	30	2	8	10	1	4	5	Score	#	%age	5	15	21.7	4	25	36.2	3	21	30.4	2	8	11.6	1	0	0	Score	#	%age	5	7	13.5	4	29	55.8	3	15	28.8	2	0	0	1	1	1.9	<p>2009</p> <p>1 We have scored in a rather mechanical fashion and not analyzed the meaning of the numerical data, or learned lessons or planned .</p> <p>2 As some key faculty were on leave this represents only a partial response.</p> <p>3 We did not set targets last year as we had no baseline on which to so. Consequently we cannot say that we have or have not reached our targets.</p> <p>4 Looking at both sets of results they appear highly satisfactory (reflecting on the students at the end of the courses, and SRP process), We are pleased with them.</p> <p>5 We are aware that there is room for improvement, for example, in depth of understanding of concepts; establishing and applying a clear research question that guides the research, and in applying concepts to findings We plan to work on identifying the problems and setting up events or actions to improve them.</p>
Score	#	%age																																																							
5	11	13.75																																																							
4	33	41.25																																																							
3	24	30																																																							
2	8	10																																																							
1	4	5																																																							
Score	#	%age																																																							
5	15	21.7																																																							
4	25	36.2																																																							
3	21	30.4																																																							
2	8	11.6																																																							
1	0	0																																																							
Score	#	%age																																																							
5	7	13.5																																																							
4	29	55.8																																																							
3	15	28.8																																																							
2	0	0																																																							
1	1	1.9																																																							

			<p>For the Spring: we will meet in February 2010 to assess the meaning of the numbers and through discussion to 1) establish better processes of assessment, 2) identify common problems; 3) to set up initiatives and a timetable to improve them. 4) In April we will try to apply indirect measures through a student survey. 5) In Fall 2010 we will set in motion new steps such as a new format for SRP info meetings and possibly add a meeting to guide students on developing research questions.</p> <p><b>2010</b>  <b>both direct and Indirect</b>  <b>After the above results we met. Overall the numbers look satisfactory, but the students showed just little less satisfaction on the first Q than is demonstrated in their grades.</b>  <b>For the ID course we will encourage greater consultation, coordination and discussion of syllabi and materials and what works and does not work.</b>  <b>On the second Q our key concern related to the need to help students in</b></p>
--	--	--	---

			<p><b>designing their research proposal; most notably how to take a vague idea and craft a focused operational research question, that would help them determine their data needs, and find answers to the question. We will take a few steps: We will hold one Friday Forum a year in which faculty will explain their research; and during our regular SRP explanation meetings (attendance will now be taken)</b></p>
--	--	--	--

<p><b>Outcome 2:</b> Develop and execute research projects that integrate theory and empirical evidence and develop analytical skills.</p>	<p><b>Direct Measure:</b> Faculty will assess quality of student work on their SRPs in terms of</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) <i>Establishing a clear research question</i></li> <li>2) <i>applying research methods and principles to an in-depth undertaking;</i></li> <li>3) <i>relating research findings to major themes in both the ID field and in the area of concentration;</i></li> <li>4) <i>drawing conclusions that not only include principal insights and themes, but also relate findings to selected themes in ID and concentration</i></li> </ol> <p>If a student excelled in all aspects (A+ if one could; or/and one gave or thought about giving a distinction for the comps) (4 ) Others one gave an A, a very</p>	<p>2009 Direct Sample of 4 professors Score</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Score</th> <th>#</th> <th>%age</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>1</td> <td>3.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>13</td> <td>41.93</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>12</td> <td>38.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>5</td> <td>16.12</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Spring 2010 Direct 5 professors</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Score</th> <th>#</th> <th>%age</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>21.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>11</td> <td>47.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>4</td> <td>17.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>3</td> <td>13%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>2010 Indirect Student measures</p> <table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>1</td> <td>5.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>9</td> <td>47.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>9</td> <td>47.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Score	#	%age	4	1	3.25	3	13	41.93	2	12	38.7	1	5	16.12	Score	#	%age	4	5	21.7	3	11	47.8	2	4	17.4	1	3	13%	5	1	5.3	4	9	47.4	3	9	47.4	2	0	0	<p>a faculty will explain how to design a research question and issues related . We are also counting on SIS's new mode of delivering research methods courses to improve student research capabilities</p>
Score	#	%age																																											
4	1	3.25																																											
3	13	41.93																																											
2	12	38.7																																											
1	5	16.12																																											
Score	#	%age																																											
4	5	21.7																																											
3	11	47.8																																											
2	4	17.4																																											
1	3	13%																																											
5	1	5.3																																											
4	9	47.4																																											
3	9	47.4																																											
2	0	0																																											

	<p>strong SRP; and you felt that the integration of theory and concept was particularly well informed and well integrated (3),</p> <p>Strong SRP, good findings, and theory and findings were clear and well integrated but not as convincing, maybe an A- , (2) and those who were somewhat weak on theory but one passed them because the overall quality and substance of the SRP was good enough (1)</p> <p>The Indirect measure comes from the Student survey mentioned above. In this case only graduating students were included as only they have completed their SRPs</p>	<p>1 0 0</p>	
--	--	--------------	--