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US Study Abroad Trends

270,604 U.S. students received academic credit for study abroad in 2009/10, a 4% increase over the previous year.

US Study Abroad Trends

- Top 5 destinations: United Kingdom, Italy, Spain, France, China

US Study Abroad Trends

US Study Abroad Trends

Semester Off-Campus Study Participation at St. Lawrence

* semester-long off-campus study only; unduplicated count
Traditional Areas of Study Abroad Assessment

• **Activities**
  – Participation rates
  – Places of study
  – Under-represented populations (minorities, low-income students, student athletes, STEM majors)

• **Fiscal aspects**
  – Program costs
  – Enrollment management issues

• **Student Satisfaction**
  – Study abroad/ senior exit surveys
  – Retention studies, etc.
Student Learning Outcomes Assessment for Study Abroad

2010 NAFSA Assessment report calls for alignment of study abroad assessment with other student learning outcomes assessment.

Larger (semester/yr) programs:
   align with other *gen ed assessments*

Short-term programs:
   treat similar to *course-level assessment*
Potential areas for assessment:

Language learning
Intercultural competence
Cognitive/knowledge
Affective/attitudes
Behavior/skills
Disciplinary knowledge
Social and emotional growth
Academic progression

Considerations for the Assessment of Study Abroad

• Happens off-campus and in many different ways
• Is one of multiple experiences students might have
• Multiple learning outcomes
• Research design
  Matching program goals with the right instrument, timing: when to survey, self-selection bias, control groups, etc.

• Measurement challenges
  Validity and reliability of instrument; data comparability; benchmarking ability
Study Abroad Assessment using the Global Perspective Inventory
Learning Goals for Diversity

1. a capacity for critical self-reflection on social location (positionality)
2. a recognition of diversity within and among groups and an awareness that these differences affect individuals’ life chances, behavior, and ways of knowing; and
3. an understanding of the dynamics of power and justice
The Global Perspective Inventory (GPI)

• Defines global perspective as a multidimensional, developmental process, involving the **cognitive** – **intrapersonal** and **interpersonal** dimension.

• The survey instrument:  64 item online survey (48 key questions on a 5-pt Likert Scale) developed by Larry Braskamp et al.  
  https://gpi.central.edu
Three Dimensions of Global Learning and Development (comprising 6 scales)

• Cognitive dimension (How do I know?)
  – Knowing (development)
  – Knowledge (acquisition)

• Intrapersonal dimension (Who am I?)
  – Identity (development)
  – Affect (acquisition)

• Interpersonal dimension (How do I relate to others?)
  – Social responsibility (development)
  – Social Interaction (acquisition)
Research Design and Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spr2010</th>
<th>Fall2010</th>
<th>Spr2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>ABROAD</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABROAD</td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>ABROAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued on next page)
Research Design and Data Collection

Data Collection

– About 1000 valid responses:
  • 306 pre-tests
  • 363 post-tests
  • 485 total replies from Senior Class of 2011
– 62 matches of pre/post and 97 post/senior surveys
**Summary of Findings**

**Net Gains of Global Perspective Due to Self Selection, College Effect and Study Abroad**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Study Abroad</th>
<th>Self-Selection</th>
<th>College Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowing</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data represents change in mean; data based on a 5-point scale, for students who studied abroad.
Semester Study Abroad increases global perspective taking

Example Longitudinal Comparison: Pre-Post Study Abroad
(Same Student n=62)
Most gains from study abroad are retained—except for interaction.
Illustrating the impact of study abroad and selection bias

* “All Pre” = pre-test for study abroad students
What are gender differences for the impact of study abroad?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowing</th>
<th>Similar growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Similar growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Similar growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>-0.1 for men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Similar growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>+ 0.1 for men (catch up to women)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This comparison looks at difference in growth (pre- to post-study abroad)
GPI Results by Study Abroad Program (Exploratory Findings)

The GPI results suggest that there are differences between programs in the extent to which they contribute to our diversity learning goals. Generally speaking, programs that include a deeper cultural and language emersion are stronger than other programs.
Steps Ahead

I. Communication
   Two presentations thus far
   • Teagle Assessment Committee
   • CIIS (Center for International & Intercultural Studies) Committee

II. How can we “close the assessment loop”

III. Development of a systematic assessment plan