

Appendix T - Career SLO Assessment October 2016

International Studies Program – Fall 2016 Assessment Report on Student Learning Outcome #6: 'the skills you need to build an international career'

As early as 2012, the International Studies Program has been involved in, and even leading, the campus effort on career education and continues to strive to scaffold career education throughout the Program. At this point, career education is integrated throughout the Program, beginning with the introductory/lower division coursework focusing on basic self-awareness and occupational research and leading up to a culminating experience in the INTL Capstone. As one of the only majors in the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences with an explicit Student Learning Outcome concerning career development, this is the first time this SLO has been assessed. This assessment has been particularly challenging in that there are few existing rubrics and no agreed system of assessment for this area. The Program Leader, with the support of the Career Center, has therefore developed a system of assessment together with four separate rubrics (attached).

Background

Career Education in the International Studies Program began with a pilot workshop: a seven-week, 1-unit, credit/no credit course first offered as a co-listed course (with Sociology) in Spring 2013. The initial pilot made two things quite clear: despite the fact most of the students taking the class were seniors, most were ill-prepared in terms of even the most basic career materials in terms of resume, cover letter etc and none had well developed occupational research or networking skills. Clearly, a senior/spring semester course was useful, but it was far too late to fill and gaps or reconsider options that were no longer interesting or viable and therefore career education had to be earlier in the curriculum. Given the fact that well over half of the INTL students receive financial aid, this approach would also support students searching for jobs while still in college as well as helping them locate and land volunteer or internship opportunities that could lead to more professional development. Over the following four years various approaches have been used throughout the program as part of our effort to find the best combination of career interventions for our students.

INTL 210: Introduction to International Studies – Basic Skills

This course is designed to introduce students to the major and covers 5 disciplines, 5 regions of the world and three current debates that highlight the issues of interdisciplinarity. The course involves a major research project, a policy paper and various other exercises such as map quizzes, locating articles on current affairs and writing response papers to guest lectures. This range of activities meant it was not overly difficult to incorporate career exploration and some basic job-relevant research skills. The assignment, placed relatively early in the semester so that it might spark interest in an organization or issue that might be useful for their research and policy assignments as students were required to create a 'wandering map' in class to explore their passions and interests. This open-ended/creative session was followed with one on the basics of resumes/cover letters (templates of these were also provided on the INTL Library Research Guide page).

They were then asked to create a 'RIP' file – so called for the low tech version of literally tearing job ads from newspapers or magazines – of 5 jobs that interested them. These could be 'now' jobs or 'later' jobs, or even graduate school options, but they could not use Craigslist or Google jobs and sources could only be used once. They then had to create a summary sheet including the basic information for each job (requirements, location, title etc) and a resume and a cover letter for one of the jobs listed. This was handed in for review by the instructor. At some point in this process, the career center was usually asked to lead a class session on resumes, but also on good ways to find job postings. Their

Appendix T - Career SLO Assessment October 2016

presence in the class was mainly to give students a face in the career center and enable them to feel more comfortable seeking those resources. RIP files were returned and discussed in class. Students then revised their resume and cover letter and handed it in a second time, together with 5 more jobs. The work does not take much time in class, but in course evaluations and in later classes, many students have reported that this exercise was very useful. More importantly, they reported that it made them think about types of jobs to apply for, volunteering opportunities on and off campus, and course options while still in college.

INTL 210: Introduction to International Studies – Short workshop with Career Center Collaboration

In addition to the RIP file, INTL has experimented with a longer career session, but still attached to the introductory course. This exercise has been done both as a requirement for the course (with an alternative assignment for those who could not make the session outside class time) and as an option for extra credit. These sessions were also valuable in that they were run in conjunction with an introductory course in the Political Science Department and therefore students could see how careers and majors interacted in terms of the skills gained in their coursework. This arrangement also meant that faculty and staff could cover two departments with a single workshop.

The name, 'clip-on', is intended to suggest that this kind of assignment/workshop could be incorporated into many different types of classes in a range of departments as much of the work took place outside regular class time. That said, it was clear from the feedback that the overall usefulness to students was enhanced by discussing the activities in the classroom setting and by connecting two majors that have related employment areas. The first clip on workshop was offered in Spring 2013 with the goal of adding more career tools without taking any more time from class content. Preparation for both classes began with a discussion about the purpose of the career assignment on the first day of class as part of the overall discussion of the course structure and continued to be raised throughout the semester.

There are a number of general conclusions or observations as to the workshop's usefulness and effectiveness and 3 stood out as important to the process of scaffolding in the Program.

1. The staff/faculty combination added significantly to student confidence that they had not only 'first hand' knowledge of what was useful in their field of choice, but there was professional support on campus in terms of other tools, databases, guides and templates they could call on.
2. The embedded nature of the workshop within a specific class meant that there was the opportunity for both pre- and post- workshop activities that extended the life of the workshop and required them to think about their materials before the event and enabled further discussion of any questions that arose as a result of the event.
3. There are benefits and challenges in attempting to cover this much ground in a single session, but if it is to be 'clipped on' to a course, the benefits seemed to outweigh the problems. Getting students to commit to a single afternoon seems less of a logistical nightmare than many other options and it could not really be any shorter and still hope to achieve its goals.

A year later, the possibility of repeating the INTL/PSCI 'clip-on' workshop presented itself so in Fall of 2014 a slightly revised version was rolled out. Perhaps the biggest difference was that, in this instance, the workshop was not 'required', but made entirely optional. This saved some organizational time and yet the sign-up remained positive (30 of a possible 49

Appendix T - Career SLO Assessment October 2016

– 4 students were in both classes) and even though the actual attendance on the day was lower (23), it was encouraging to see how many from both classes took a Friday afternoon to be present at an entirely optional event and how many completed the feedback form (19). Other than becoming optional, we did try to hold the essentials of the assignments to be the same, though there was no employer panel as funding was scarce and it was decided that a panel in the Spring in conjunction with the full Career workshop would be sufficient.

According to the sign-in sheet and the anonymous post-workshop survey, the breakdown of attendees by major was: 12 International Studies, 10 and 1 foreign exchange student for a total of 23 while the respondents were 10 IS, 8 PSCI and 1 foreign exchange for a total of 19 while the class standing was more spread with only 2 seniors, 7 juniors and 6 sophomores and still only a few freshmen.

In terms of conclusions from this second experience there were no new observations, only additions (added in italics to last year's conclusion):

1. The staff/faculty combination added significantly to student confidence – *though we would add that, since that last workshop it has been the experience that this 'face time' with the Career Center has a noticeable impact on student willingness to take advantages of services they might not otherwise know about or pursue.*
2. The embedded nature of the workshop within a specific class meant that there was the opportunity for both pre- and post- workshop activity that extended the life of the workshop - *we would add that the optional vs required nature of the workshop may have dropped the numbers by a marginal number, but the benefits of this approach seem to remain.*
3. There are benefits and challenges to attempting to cover this much ground in a single session - *time was again a challenge, but there seems to be limited alternatives.*

INTL 480 then INTL 320 –Special Topics then Career Workshop Intermediate to Advanced Level: 1 unit workshop

In terms of the goals of a 1-unit workshop, it's clear that it enables more in-depth student support/faculty partnership and can be built directly into a student's major plan. Students are also able to choose when to take such a workshop, which, particularly for INTL students who are required to go abroad, can be very useful. Interestingly, some students opt to take it twice; once to prepare for going away and again when they near graduation.

Despite being nearly at the point of graduation, many students had had very little guidance as to basic job search skills; nor had many reviewed their resume and cover letter with any of the available professionals on campus. They also seemed unfamiliar with, and unable to navigate, issues of professional etiquette and were unaware of various professional networking avenues open to them while still students or even the most basic requirements of the positions they claimed they had 'always' wanted to pursue. Perhaps the best example of this is the number of INTL students interested in the Peace Corps (INTL is a large feeder major into the Peace Corps – in fact, for our size, HSU is regularly in the top ten, if not top five such schools with INTL providing a significant number to that group), but had little or no relevant volunteer experience – a basic requirement.

The 1-unit workshop is also a good way to make the materials and exercises directly relevant to the major and those of interest to the student. International Studies students tend to divide fairly evenly into thirds in terms of those interested in the Peace Corps, USAID, teaching English overseas, or NGO work, those wanting to pursue graduate school,

Appendix T - Career SLO Assessment October 2016

or those who wish to look into more traditional government work (State Department) or the private sector. This means the workshop gives us time to explore all three (and some end up changing their direction as a result of learning more/discovering misconceptions/redirecting their aspirations) including time consuming activities such as mock interviews for every student or individual editing of letters and statements.

INTL 490 – Capstone, Advanced Level

Generally speaking, the capstone would be a logical place for many aspects of career education. In terms of being a way to have a final check on student readiness, support for the actual application planning and processing, and relevant professional networking. For majors with a high unit count or no other space in the program for an additional unit, this may be ideal. However, given the needs of various student constituencies and the overall perspective of millennials generally, this may be far too late.

For the International Studies Program, the capstone class is designed to be the course where majors bring all the elements of the program together. They do a career portfolio, an academic portfolio and explore theories of leadership so they can devise their own 'leadership pledge' for the future. The core of the class is a project they design themselves that either consolidates work they have already done or positions them in relation to their post college plans. When the career workshop was only a pilot or just an elective, this was the only way to ensure that all majors had a resume, cover letter, some job research skills and the opportunity to do a mock interview. In practice, it meant that students who had not done the workshop were effectively rushed through the career aspects of the class given neither portfolio is intended to be the main work or focus of the class, but rather a stock-taking of work already done.

Evaluations from the workshop and steady enrollment suggested that the workshop was becoming an important part of the program. Therefore, in 2016, the faculty took the decision to put the workshop into the core where it will be required as of 2017.

Process and Data

Without the benefit of standard rubrics and templates for career education assessment, the Program had to effectively start from scratch. The goal was to decide a process that would determine the usefulness of career education and the ability or success of scaffolding of career education.

Given the SLO was premised on 'skills' we primarily focused on career outputs or the direct products of the course activities. These outputs included a resume, cover letter and mock interview and because we sought to see how career education worked across the program we used resumes from INTL 210 as well as 320 and 490 and all three outputs from INTL 320 and 490 (INTL 210 doesn't do mock interviews).

However, as these do not speak to student confidence or sense of preparedness, proxies here for career course outcomes (the indirect benefits of career education such as GPA and retention), a short essay assignment was added to the INTL 320 class and INTL 490 Career Portfolios.

The next step was to create rubrics for each of these three outputs as well as another, revised rubric, for the outcome proxy. Using various rubrics as a starting point, three basic rubrics were developed using five characteristics and a scale of acceptable, acceptable, and exemplary for a total possible of 25 points. The exception was the essay rubric, though the

Appendix T - Career SLO Assessment October 2016

five characteristics were retained, clearly the three levels didn't apply. The hope was to create a standard assessment process.

The committee was made up of Alison Holmes (IS Program Leader) and Loren Collins (Faculty Support Coordinator for Service Learning and Career Education). As Holmes taught two of the classes involved, she has already seen and assessed the outputs so there was no opportunity to entirely norm the rubrics nor was there an opportunity to go through them all together.

Curricular Conclusions

1) It looks like the 320 is doing a better job preparing students than the 490 (perhaps not surprising as it is 7 weeks focused solely on careers) which supports our decision to put 320 in the INTL core. Clearly, and as a direct consequence of that decision, the career portfolio in the Capstone will need to be revisited.

2) The iterative process for career portfolios materials is crucial. This clearly comes through in the data for the 'before and after' in 320 and suggests we need to understand that while students may say they have a resume, it's clear that when asked to work through their initial draft they are able to make significant improvements. This suggests that we need to build in more time for two or even three drafts of the resume and consider spending more time on the cover letter as well (though this is difficult as many are not actually applying for a specific job at the time and this piece needs to be very focused on a particular job).

3) As a Program, we have consistently done assessment not only at the senior level but across the curriculum. This SLO assessment has followed suit so, while we do not have longitudinal data, we do see a large improvement from 210 to the 320/490 and are encouraged by this cross-section of students.

4) In terms of areas that require work, it would seem that our students tend to fall down on "greeting/first impression" for the mock interviews. This supports our anecdotal sense that our casual campus atmosphere leads them to believe that there is little need to 'look the part' and that students tend to see the benefit of the mock interview more after the fact. I feel confident that if we had the time to give them a second round of interviews they would rise to the occasion. Slightly more worrying is the fact that the content areas of the cover letter are somewhat lacking, though again, that could be a matter of the vague, non-specific nature of these letters especially as there is no comparable problem for the resumes.

There is little in the way of systemic assessment of career development courses anywhere that we can find. However, given our research and our work with students over the past four years, we feel reasonably confident that the international studies program is going in a positive direction. We look forward to learning from other majors and programs on campus as well as other universities as more and more begin to undertake the kind of work we are doing and will review our approach and our rubrics accordingly. In the meantime, Holmes in partnership with Collins has submitted two papers for publication based on the work going on here at HSU in the hope of stimulating a broader conversation both in our own community and further afield.

arh 2016

Appendix T - Career SLO Assessment October 2016

RESUME Scoring Rubric

Name: _____

Elements	Not Acceptable = 1 pt	Acceptable = 3 pts	Exemplary = 5 pts	Comments
Aesthetics	Confusing layout; inconsistent formatting; mistakes in spelling, grammar etc; too much or too little space	Generally able to be understood; information and descriptions generally clear but raises some new questions or not fully explained	Good use of space; appropriate use of graphics and fonts; key information easily located	
Composition	Too many/not enough/unclear headings; Spelling and grammar errors; no form or reason to statements or bullet points	Generally able to follow organization and flow; very few mistakes in spelling and grammar; some use of resume statements or bullets but not well developed	Clear organization; clean and consistent layout; free of grammar, spelling errors; effective use of "resume" sentence/ phrasing	
Content	No flow of narrative; not enough/too much information in key areas; background, education and experience not fully explained; more questions raised than answered	There is some sense of narrative but not consistent; statements or bullets not fully explained; some flow but not always clear how or why one thing relates to others in the same area	Clear narrative; outlines background, education and experience fully and with specifics; fully developed statements or bullets; logical flow	
Education	Education not showcased; important skills (eg language, study abroad or social media) left out or not specified; non-academic or community work not clearly explained for non HSU audience	Education listed but not well used to highlight skills or significant/relevant areas; Activities 'undersold' by virtue of bad layout or explanation	Degrees/grades etc clear and well laid out; relevant skills gained clearly highlighted; coursework – if listed - explained succinctly; extra-curricular and community activity set out for non HSU audience;	
Experience	Experience jumbled by too many categories or not enough information; descriptions begin with the menial vs the most relevant/important skills so key aspects are lost; too little or too much information; written in first person	Positions laid out but not fully supporting the overall narrative; inconsistency in information provided leaving a 'patchy' flow; preoccupied with paid employment and not enough focus on skills and abilities; over or under selling particular aspects and lack of balance	Relevance to the position made clear; includes specifics with details and/or accomplishments; clear delineation for categories of experience; demonstrates progression of responsibility/title; supports the overall narrative of the resume and cover letter combined	
Overall Possible: 25 points				

Appendix T - Career SLO Assessment October 2016

COVER LETTER Scoring Rubric

Name: _____

Elements	Not Acceptable = 1 pt	Acceptable = 3 pts	Exemplary = 5 pts	Comments
Aesthetics	Not professional in appearance (crumpled, stained, odd margins); No clear contact or addressee information; poor formatting; too much or too little space	Letter generally looks clear and professional; contact and organization information clear and correct	Professional appearance; clear placement of contact and addressee information; clean fonts and formatting	
Composition	No flow or order to the way things are discussed; spelling and grammar errors; confusing sentences or main points and little connection between the person and the position	Generally able to follow organization and flow; very few mistakes in spelling and grammar; some connection between the narrative and the position, but not maximized	Clear organization; clean and consistent layout; free of grammar, spelling errors; overall narrative that clearly connects the resume/person to the position	
Introduction/Opening Paragraph	May or may not cover basic information and only a tenuous or weak way into the body of the letter and establishes no link between the person and the position	Covers basic information but only a lackluster way of getting into the core content of the letter	Covers basic information but offers an engaging and gripping way into the body of the letter and clearly connects the person to the position	
Letter Body/Content	No flow of narrative; not enough/too much information in key areas; background, education and experience not fully explained; more questions raised than answered; all assertions without foundation or specifics to support them	There is some sense of narrative but not consistent; background, education and experience laid out but not connected to the position; some unsupported assertions but also some good examples of the connections between the person and the position	Clear narrative; outlines background, education and experience fully and with specifics that connect directly to the position; is less about them per se but focused on how they fit the job and will be effective members of the organization	
Closing	Not a strong closing statement; repetitive or wandering; no clear 'final message' to the reader and how they fit the job as outlined	Has a sense of a closing statement but unenthusiastic or unconvincing; too many messages that get cluttered; no succinct final message for the organization	Strong closing statement of purpose; clearly outlines how their background, education and experience have prepared them for this specific position (without being repetitive)	
Overall Possible: 25 points				

MOCK INTERVIEW Scoring Rubric

Name: _____

Appendix T - Career SLO Assessment October 2016

Key Element	Not Acceptable = 1pt	Acceptable = 3 pts	Exemplary = 5 pts	Comments
Greeting/ First Impressions	Turns up late; not dressed appropriately; does not shake hands and/or greet interviewer(s); does not bring a copy of resume or is otherwise unprepared; lackluster and distracted	Turns up on time; dressed appropriately for the position; has resume/other relevant materials ready; and to hand; greeting acceptable, but not engaged or engaging	Turns up on time/early; appropriately/professionally dressed; has resume/other material ready; Clear enthusiastic greeting and maintains direct, respectful eye contact and relaxed body language	
Poise/Voice	Posture slumped or shifting; fidgeting with feet or hands; looks at the floor or ceiling when speaking and makes no eye contact; grammar and language are not appropriate (eg "um" or "like"); voice too soft or loud/ too fast or slow	Posture generally acceptable with relatively little fidgeting; adequate eye contact that is clear on important points; language and grammar acceptable with relatively few verbal ticks; voice usually clear and consistent	Posture calm and confident; no fidgeting and excellent eye contact without staring; language, grammar and voice clear and fluid without verbal ticks and use of appropriate humor	
Interview Techniques/ Preparation	Not paying attention to what is being asked and didn't answer questions directly or completely; had not thought about how they wanted to answer key questions or what they had to offer; not prepared or knowledgeable about the organization/ position; could not clearly articulate why they were suited or their own background/ education/ or experience	Didn't answer important questions clearly or completely; had prepared some answers in advance to the point they sounded false or rehearsed; had done only basic research into the organization/position; had thought about how their background/ education/experience but were not fluid in their answers as to how that connected to the organization	Listened carefully to what was being asked and answered each question clearly and completely; had prepared answers to some questions without sounding stilted or rehearsed; Knowledgeable about organization/ position; able to promote themselves and explain their background/ education/ experience without sounding gushy, arrogant or pushy	
Self-Promoting/ General Attitude	Answers questions in generalities with no reference to personal strengths, skills and abilities; lack of interest and enthusiasm passive; or overly enthusiastic	Answers a few questions with some reference to personal strengths, skills and abilities; seems interested but could be better prepared or informed.	Answers questions with reference to strengths, skills and abilities and how they contribute to the position; interested and enthusiastic about the interview, organization and process	
Closing	Has no closing statement or questions (or only obvious/inappropriate questions); shows no interest in the position or next steps; does not shake hands or thank the interviewer	Has a weak closing statement and only relatively weak questions; shows only lukewarm interest in the position or the process; unenthusiastically thanked the interviewer and/or shook hands	Strong, enthusiastic closing/summary of their interest in the position; has a number of engaging and relevant questions that have been prepared in advance and come from the interview; engaged with the process going forward	
OVERALL possible: 25 points				

REFLECTION ESSAY Assessment

Name: _____

Appendix T - Career SLO Assessment October 2016

Elements	Y	N	Student Comments/Observations	Assessor Comments/Observations
Short term plan for 3- 6 months				
Medium term plan for 6-9 months				
Long term plan for 9-12 months/post college				
Feel Better prepared for remaining time at HSU				
Feel Better prepared for career search after HSU				
Final Reflections				