

2015-2016 Yearly Assessment Report
M.A. in Asia Pacific Studies (MAPS)
College of Arts and Sciences (CAS)
University of San Francisco
Oct. 3, 2016

1. Identifying Information

Name of Program: Master's in Asia Pacific Studies

Type of Program (Major, Minor, Graduate Program, Non-Degree Granting): Graduate

College of Arts and Sciences Division: (Humanities)

Name/Title/Email Address of Submitter: John Nelson, Academic Director,
nelsonj@usfca.edu

Name/Email Address of Additional Individuals Who Should Receive Feedback: Brian
Dempster, Director of Administration, dempster@usfca.edu

2. Mission Statement

The USF Masters in Asia Pacific Studies (MAPS) Program provides education in the histories, cultures, contemporary politics, economics, and languages of the Asia Pacific region.

We accomplish our program goals through seminars, directed studies, public programs, and extracurricular opportunities such as internships, all of which draw upon and utilize resources in the San Francisco Bay Area.

The Program offers students “the knowledge and skills needed to succeed as persons and professionals” and promotes an awareness of social justice when appropriate.

(revised Feb. 2016)

3. Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

“Students completing the MAPS program will be able to demonstrate...”

1. an ability to apply research tools and methods to analyze critically topics within classic disciplines and contemporary interdisciplinary fields of Asia Pacific Studies.
2. an understanding of sociocultural histories and traditions, political and economic patterns of development, organizational practices and behaviors, and contemporary events as evidenced in the Asia Pacific region.

3. oral and written proficiency in an Asian language corresponding to the fourth semester of USF undergraduate courses, or the equivalent level in languages not taught at USF.

4. practical experience in Asia-Pacific related contexts via opportunities for academic and professional development such as internships, fieldwork, conferences, symposia, public programs, class excursions and other types of experiential learning.

(revised Feb. 2016)

4. Brief Summary of Most Recent Assessment Plan

We want to understand better how seminar assignments both complement and contribute to the overall program outcomes, as well as how they meet specific learning outcomes. For the overall program, outcome #2 is central to our interdisciplinary emphasis and will be prioritized at the start and continued year-to-year.

The assessment plan for the MAPS Program follows these steps:

1. Using course syllabi, major assignments in core seminars are compiled by the academic director. The major assignment generally consists of a final paper or final exam, or both.
2. Next, a faculty committee (convened by the academic director and composed of three people) identifies what elements in seminar assignments should be assessed. The goal here is to understand student achievement relevant to a single program learning outcome (PLO).
3. A scoring rubric is designed that includes the designated elements to be assessed. The rubric is applied across all core seminars in a given academic term to assess one major assignment in each course.

Assessment Rubrics

Program Learning Outcome #2 <i>Students critically demonstrate...</i>	Advanced Student work in this seminar shows...	Intermediate	Elementary
<i>an understanding of sociocultural histories and traditions... as evidenced in the Asia Pacific region.</i>	...how social and cultural traditions shape and impact contemporary individuals... without any major flaws in content, argument and writing style.	...critical reflection about the theme, but contains some problems in terms of content, argument, and writing style.	...a basic thematic understanding but with problems in terms of content, argument, and writing style.

<i>...political and economic patterns of development as evidenced in the Asia Pacific region.</i>	...how development follows political and economic patterns... without any major flaws in content, argument and writing style.	...how development follows political and economic patterns... with only minor issues in terms of content, argument, and writing style.	...how development follows political and economic patterns... although there are issues of critical engagement, content, and writing style.
<i>...organizational practices and behaviors as evidenced in the Asia Pacific region.</i>	...how organizations influence society... without any major flaws in content, argument and writing style.	...organizational influence... with some problems in terms of content, argument, and writing style.	...a basic thematic understanding but with problems in terms of content, argument, and writing style.
<i>...contemporary events as evidenced in the Asia Pacific region.</i>	...how events in contemporary Asia-Pacific are shaped by the previous three categories... without any major flaws in content, argument and writing style.	...how events in contemporary Asia-Pacific are shaped by the previous three categories... with some flaws in content, argument and writing style.	...a basic thematic understanding but with problems in terms of content, argument, and writing style.

4. The committee and academic director score the seminar assignments using the rubric.

- a. All core seminar instructors from Spring 2016 submitted a key assignment, using four-to-five students' work as representative samples
- b. The committee then rated each of the papers to determine whether or not students are meeting the key elements defined in the rubric of that PLO

5. Upon completion of the scoring and rating of student work, a curriculum map was used to chart student achievement in each core seminar. It was apparent by the conclusion of this phase how and to what degree the seminar assignment resonates with the designated PLO.

6. Since extracurricular and experiential learning is utilized frequently in the program, we assess these activities via selected program learning outcomes that students self-assess. Each student gives two examples of how the activity's content resonates with a PLO, as well as how it can be applied in other contexts relevant to Asia Pacific studies. They also have a rubric to fill out that categorizes the usefulness of the event or activity. Finally, they return the two examples and the rubric to the academic director via Canvas.

Together with the faculty assessment committee, we will then use this data to see how and to what degree a particular PLO is achieved. It may also be the case that these experiences and activities have some bearing on the Capstone project required of all students in the program.

7. Finally, it is important to note that there is no correspondence between the work of the assessment committee and the grading of student work upon which assessment is based. The latter activity is within the purview of the seminar instructor.

5. Academic Program Review

Date of most recent Academic Program Review's External Reviewer Visit:

April 13-15, 2016

Date of Action Plan Meeting: Nov. 8, 2016

Brief Summary of the most recent Action Plan: Pending

6. Methods

- What did you do with regard to assessment of your program/department in 2015-2016?

We formulated, submitted, revised, and then implemented an assessment plan as required by the USF office of Assessment. Since we were required to have all assessment done through a faculty committee, we had to wait until fall to assess the spring semester.

- What were your questions?

How do seminar assignments (related to PLO #2) both complement and contribute to overall program outcomes, as well as specific learning outcomes?

- How are these questions related to your most recent Academic Program Review and/or Action Plan?

No correlation as of yet.

- What PLOs are these questions related to?

#2 : "Students completing the MAPS program will be able to demonstrate..."

...an understanding of sociocultural histories and traditions, political and economic patterns of development, organizational practices and behaviors, and contemporary events as evidenced in the Asia Pacific region.

What direct (most important) and/or indirect methods did you employ?

- Research papers
- Final Exams

7. Results

- What were the direct data results?

The direct results indicated that a program-wide effort needs to be made to better align course and program learning outcomes.

- What were the indirect results?

We did not employ indirect methods.

- What surprised you?

There were no surprises that were overly dramatic.

- What aligned with your expectations?

We expected there to be some slippage and disconnects between the assignment, course learning outcomes, and program learning outcomes.

- What are the implications of the data?

First, that student learning needs to be positioned more intentionally to meet course learning outcomes. At present and after conducting this admittedly limited assessment, this is the main concern to address for the current semester. During academic year 2016-2017, we will assess all seminars in the program following the guidelines stated above.

Second, after course outcomes are better integrated with course content and reflected in improved student performance, we can then better align course learning outcomes and program outcomes.

8. Closing the Loop

- What might you do as a result of these assessment results? What curricular or programmatic changes might you implement?

b) It seems prudent at this point to more closely observe how course learning outcomes are shaping student learning...or not.

c, d) Instructors in the program have to do a better job of shaping course content so that students can meet the stated learning outcomes, or revise the outcomes accordingly.

k) It may also be the case that better rubrics are needed.

Possible Closing(s) of the Loop(s) (pick ≥ 1 and *briefly describe*):

- a. Revision of PLOs
- b. Changes in pedagogical practices
- c. Revision of program course sequence
- d. Revision of course(s) content
- e. Curriculum Changes (e.g., addition and/or deletion of courses)
- f. Modified program policies or procedures
- g. Designed measurement tools more aptly suited for the task
- h. Improved within and across school/college collaboration
- i. Improved within and across school/college communication
- j. Revised student learning outcomes in one or more courses
- k. Modified rubric
- l. Developed new rubric
- m. Developed more stringent measures (key assessments)
- n. Modified course offering schedules
- o. Changes to faculty and/or staff
- p. Changes in program modality of delivery
- q. Other

Have you or will you submit any course or program change proposals as a result of these results?

Too soon to say.