

Program Assessment Plan

American University

Academic Program: SIS: International Affairs: International Economic Relations - MA

Academic Program: SIS: International Affairs: International Economic Relations - MA

Contact Person for Professor Tamar Gutner

Assessment:

Unit's Primary Department: Intl Politics/Intl Econ.

COLA Reader -1: Betsy Cohn

COLA Reader -2: Chana Barron

Learning Outcome: Concepts and Theories of Global Economy

Students will be able to show an ability to apply concepts and theories from international economics and political economy to explain the workings of and issues facing the global economy.

Outcome Year: 2009-2010

2010-2011

Start Date: 11/17/2009

End Date: 05/31/2011

Outcome Status: Archived Program Outcome

Assessment Plan			
Assessment Measure	Target	Schedule/Cycle	Active
<p>Spring 2010, 2012 Direct Measure: capstone paper. Faculty members will review the capstones submitted each spring using a rubric of specific criteria, and scores of "excellent," "satisfactory," and "poor."</p> <p>Spring 2011: We wanted to try a different way of measuring it this year. We invited IER students to present a major research paper to a panel of five IER faculty members. Each student had 10 minutes to present, followed by 10 minutes of Q&A. The faculty scored each presentation on a scale of 1-5 (1 is the lowest, 5 is the highest) in the following categories: ability to succinctly state the research question; clear explanation of key findings; persuasiveness about academic significance and/or policy relevance of findings; professional quality of presentation (appropriate dress, oral delivery and articulation, visual aids); ability to answer questions directly and thoughtfully. The first three categories were related to this learning outcome.</p> <p>Measure Type: Final Paper/ Final Project</p>	<p>For the first measure, in 2010, at least 70 of students achieving "satisfactory" or better.</p> <p>Our target was for students to achieve a score of 3 or better for the second measure's three criteria. Student scores ranged from 1 to 4, with the average scores at 2.8, 2.8, and 2.6, respectively.</p>	<p>We carried out the first assessment measure in May 2010 and will next carry it out in May 2012. We discuss results at the subsequent September program meeting, where we will determine adjustments to the curriculum to improve areas where results are weak.</p> <p>We will carry out the second assessment measure each spring.</p> <p>We carried out the second assessment measure in April 2011 and discussed the findings in Fall 2011.</p>	Yes
<p>Indirect measure: Feedback from Zoomerang survey of graduating students.</p> <p>Measure Type: Survey</p>	No target identified.	Data will be collected each May, and results will be discussed by faculty at the September field meeting, where we will determine adjustments to the curriculum to improve areas where results are weak.	Yes
<p>Faculty members will review the SRPs each spring using a rubric of specific criteria, and scores of "excellent," "satisfactory," and "poor."</p> <p>Indirect measure: feedback from Zoomerang survey of graduating students.</p> <p>Measure Type: Final Paper/ Final Project</p>	At least 70% of students achieve "excellent," "satisfactory," or better.	We focused on this outcome in 2009-10, and 2010-11.	No

Learning Outcome: Research Projects

Students will be able to develop and execute research projects that integrate theory and empirics and develop writing and analytical skills.

Outcome Year: 2010-2011

Start Date: 11/17/2010

Outcome Status: Active Learning Outcome

Assessment Plan			
Assessment Measure	Target	Schedule/Cycle	Active
Direct measure: SRP papers. Faculty members will review the SRPs each spring using a rubric of specific criteria, and scores of "excellent," "satisfactory," and "poor." Measure Type: Written Assignment	At least 70% of students achieve "satisfactory" or better.	This was active in 2009-2010. It may be revisited in future. We collected data in spring, and discussed results then, and in September program meeting, where we determined adjustments to the curriculum to improve areas where we were weak.	No
Indirect measure: Feedback from Zoomerang survey of graduating students. Measure Type: Survey	No target identified.	Data will be collected each May, and results will be discussed by faculty in the September field meeting, where we will determine adjustments to the curriculum to improve areas where results are weak.	No

Learning Outcome: Major Schools of Thought in International Economics

Students will be able to describe and distinguish among the major schools of thought in international economics and international political economy.

Outcome Year: 2010-2011

Start Date: 11/17/2010

Outcome Status: Active Learning Outcome

Learning Outcome: Facts and Concepts in International Trade

Students will be able to master basic facts and concepts in international trade, monetary, and financial relations.

Outcome Year: 2010-2011

2011-2012

2012-2013

Start Date: 11/17/2010

Outcome Status: Active Learning Outcome

Assessment Plan			
Assessment Measure	Target	Schedule/Cycle	Active
Examine random sample of capstone papers from SIS 665 (International Trade and Investment Relations) and final exams from SIS 666 (International Monetary and Financial Relations). Measure Type: Final Paper/ Final Project	At least 70% satisfactory or better using rubric that looked at knowledge of basic facts, mastery of relevant policy debates, measured as "poor," "satisfactory," or "excellent."	We started this in Spring 2012, and will continue in 2012-13 academic year.	Yes

Related Action Steps

* Supporting Assessment: Evaluation of capstone papers and final exams

Description: We discussed the importance of students? drawing out broader implications of policy issues and cases, broadening their understanding of major policy debates, and developing a deeper understanding of the literature.

On monetary and financial relations, we agreed faculty teaching 666 would try to evaluate critical thinking skills in

the final exam and make sure opportunities for students to develop those skills are present in the classroom. In our discussion of the course and its results, we also agreed it would be useful to give students an opportunity to use their quantitative skills in classes beyond their required methodology courses. Professor Tuomi, who teaches 666, agreed to add a research assignment that would give students a chance to use quantitative analysis.

We agreed on a few other changes as a result of this process. First, we agreed to change objective 4 to two objectives. One would focus on mastery of basic facts, and the other will be ?Demonstrate critical thinking about central policy debates.?

Learning Outcome: Speaking Skills

Students will be able to develop speaking skills so they can clearly and effectively convey their knowledge.

Outcome Year: 2010-2011

2011-2012

2012-2013

Start Date: 11/17/2010

Outcome Status: Active Learning Outcome

Assessment Plan			
Assessment Measure	Target	Schedule/Cycle	Active
Graduate Student Research Conference Beginning in Spring 2011, we invited IER students to present a major research paper to a panel of five IER faculty members. Each student had 10 minutes to present, followed by 10 minutes of Q&A. The faculty scored each presentation on a scale of 1-5 (1 is the lowest, 5 is the highest) in the following categories: ability to succinctly state the research question; clear explanation of key findings; persuasiveness about academic significance and/or policy relevance of findings; professional quality of presentation (appropriate dress, oral delivery and articulation, visual aids); ability to answer questions directly and thoughtfully. Measure Type: Other	We wanted to see the average score in each category to be about 3 (out of 5).	We will hold this research conference each spring.	Yes

Learning Outcome: Critical Thinking

Demonstrate critical thinking about central policy debates

Outcome Year: 2012-2013

Start Date: 09/03/2012

Outcome Status: Active Program Outcome