

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Summary

Cross-Cultural Studies, MA

College of Liberal Arts

AY 2016-2017

Submitted by: Michael Koskey

Contact Information: mskoskey@alaska.edu

Date: 11/29/17

1. Assessment information collected

The three primary criteria for evaluating student learning under the MA in Cross-Cultural Studies are:

1. Performance in academic coursework;
2. Successful completion of a comprehensive exam during the semester before graduation; and,
3. Submission and successful defense of a final project or thesis, as determined by the student's graduate committee.

Student outcomes and assessment align with the mission and goals of CCS – in addition to successful completion of coursework, assessment criteria and procedures include:

1. Ability to apply knowledge and skills gained in implementing practical solutions to real-world problems,
2. Compare and analyze the epistemological properties, worldviews and modes of transmission associated with various indigenous knowledge systems (Alaska emphasis),
3. Apply cross cultural understandings and communication skills,
4. Effective collaboration with Indigenous peoples,
5. Apply principles of cross-cultural research methodologies and methods,
6. Conduct research relevant to Alaska and the Arctic that contributes to cultural, practices, community well being, and quality of life.

Student outcomes are assessed through Comprehensive Exams 1 (research proposal), 2, (literature review) and 3 (methodology); the graduate committee also conducts and evaluates student outcomes through the Oral Comprehensive Exam. Committee chairs

closely monitor students' IRB application, the research process and dissemination of research.

Five students have graduated during the period of this review (2013-2017), and these were used for data collection. Each of these students was rated according to the categories above: coursework, comprehensive exam, final project or thesis, and criteria 1-6 above.

2. Conclusions drawn from the information summarized above

During the period covered in this review (2013-2017) there were six students who were expected to graduate, but who have not. Four of these students have become inactive in the program and most have not provided reasons why they left, though two explained that it was because of financial issues. The other two have not responded. The other two who remain active have not completed their degrees yet due to personal issues regarding work and family.

Otherwise the others who did graduate during this period were assessed according to the gradual and step-by-step process of completing and being evaluated for work in classes, comprehensive exams, and the final project/thesis.

3. Curricular changes resulting from conclusions drawn above

Curricular changes are made semester-by-semester according to the evaluations according to students, instructor self-evaluations, and once or twice a year, and evaluation of classes overall. As student needs shift, and as social and cultural needs and concerns change regarding indigenous peoples and their communities, class curricula is revised, and new courses are created—first as special topics and the, if enough interest has been shown, as standard classes.

At the present these outcomes assessments are qualitatively evaluated at the level of course, graduate advisory committee, and departmental review. Besides the quantitative evaluations of the classes (in part) by students in our classes, we prefer to use qualitative categorical measures that more fully enable an understanding of student needs and learning outcomes.

4. Identify the faculty members involved in reaching the conclusions drawn above and agreeing upon the curricular changes resulting.

Raymond Barnhardt, Emeritus (2013-present)

Beth Leonard (2013-2016), chair (to mid-2016)

Theresa John (2013-present)

Michael Koskey (2014-present), chair (interim to mid-2016; chair mid-2016 to present)