

Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program: Russian Studies	Department: Languages, Literatures, Cultures
Degree or Certificate Level: B.A.	College/School: Arts and Sciences
Date (Month/Year): June 2020	Primary Assessment Contact: Elizabeth Blake
In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? 2018-19	
In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? Under review	

1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

Graduates will critically engage Russian studies in the areas of history, literature, political science, religion, and philosophy in order to examine in a comparative manner their native culture's attitudes, traditions, beliefs, and patterns of behavior. Therefore, they will be able to interact with respect and cultural sensitivity in a variety of formal and informal situations.

2. Assessment Methods: Student Artifacts

Which student artifacts were used to determine if students achieved this outcome? Please identify the course(s) in which these artifacts were collected. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

In the historical theology course, The Russian Orthodox, and its approximation (4980) under the philosophy/theology category, I collected for the three majors graduating this year their final essays, completed in the 2019-2020 academic year. This was chosen, because all three graduates completed a similar assignment of substantial length at the 4XXX level allowing the program to determine the students' ability to discuss advanced cultural topics in the areas of history (with some attention to political science) and theology. This course was conducted on the Frost campus.

3. Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process

What process was used to evaluate the student artifacts, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and include them in/with this report.

The process included the collection of thesis and bibliography, which preceded the final assignment by the instructor. Students were also given a prior presentation and paper on a single source to prepare them for the level of critical analysis necessary for the longer paper. Two out of three of the students attended a class session on locating resources at Pius Library with a research librarian. Students were encouraged to discuss the paper with the professor. The final artifacts were collected by the instructor.

4. Data/Results

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcomes? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

Areas of particular strength were in the mechanics of writing and in cultural sensitivity, and a slight weakness was demonstrated in students' ability to locate and include reputable research sources in their papers. Students' writing ability met program expectations. Please see the attached rubric for further information.

5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you?

The program meets robust writing and critical thinking requirements but should support research methods in a more intentional manner.

6. Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of Current Assessment Findings

A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss these results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

The full-time program faculty will receive these results and consider their impact over the summer while assessment is being revised. Then there will be a meeting in the fall before assessment is defined for 2020-21.

B. How specifically have you decided to use findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you've initiated one or more of the following:

Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies

- Course content
- Teaching techniques
- Improvements in technology
- Prerequisites

- Course sequence
- New courses
- Deletion of courses
- Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings

Changes to the Assessment Plan

- Student learning outcomes
- Student artifacts collected
- Evaluation process

- Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics)
- Data collection methods
- Frequency of data collection

Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of the findings.

The culture course now meets a diversity requirement, the learning outcome is still valid, the results suggest that the prerequisites/sequencing are adequate, and the program/course content was sufficient to yield the desired outcome, so no changes are anticipated to meet outcome #3. These latest results have already been addressed to some extent, since student projects were part of the 3XXX level courses this past year (after the submission of assignments being analyzed).

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

Various options will be discussed as to how to include more support for research methods in the program. New coursework may introduced, or the program may include more research projects in the curriculum.

7. Closing the Loop: Review of Previous Assessment Findings and Changes

A. What is at least one change your program has implemented in recent years as a result of assessment data?

The 2020 course was added to increase language proficiency, the culture survey was counted among the core requirements for diversity, more focus on new media has been added, and there has been improvement in methods on feedback in courses requiring writing.

B. How has this change/have these changes been assessed?

The syllabi have been changed, the writing has been assessed in the current set of examples, the core requirement was approved, and language proficiency will be assessed in the coming year.

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

In the 2017-2018 assessment, it was noted that students needed more support in writing than that which had been provided by core and program courses. This current assessment let the program know that the instructors met this goal for development of writing skills through changes in assignments and encouraging student presentations.

D. How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

I will share with the department the need to sustain the current level of support for written and analytical skills, in general, and more specifically in the rigorous disciplines of history and theology. I will also share the need for more intentional support of research methods, although to some extent this has been addressed.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools and/or revised/updated assessment plans along with this report.

Rubric for Assessment, B.A. Russian Studies (History/Theology/Philosophy)

Learning Outcome	Meeting Assessment Minimums				
Graduates will critically engage Russian studies in the areas of history, literature, political science, religion, and philosophy in order to examine in a comparative manner their native culture's attitudes, traditions, beliefs, and patterns of behavior. Therefore, they will be able to interact with respect and cultural sensitivity in a variety of formal and informal situations.	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%
	The author has effectively chosen and introduced secondary literature from academic presses to defend a defined argument over the course of ten pages.	The author has structured a sophisticated and original argument, which is logically defended over the course of ten pages.	The author has engaged Russian theological studies with attention to its historical development, as defined by Western scholarship.	The author has expressed cultural sensitivity in researching and writing about belief systems in Russia.	Grammatical and spelling mistakes do not substantially interfere with comprehension of the main thrust of the author's argument or its supporting points.
	Sample One: ME	ME	ME	EE	EE
	Sample Two: DE	ME	ME	EE	EE
	Sample Three: EE	EE	EE	EE	EE