

---

EXTERNAL PROGRAM REVIEW

B.A. in GLOBAL STUDIES

DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY, ENVIRONMENT & PLANNING

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

SONOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

November 16-20, 2020

---

**Dr. Matthew Derrick**

Chair, Department of Geography, Environment & Spatial Analysis

Program Leader, International Studies

## CONTENTS

Introduction.....	3
Overview.....	4
Curriculum Coherency and Currency.....	6
Relevance and Clarity of Learning Outcomes and Integration with Curriculum.....	9
Meaningfulness and Effectiveness of Learning Outcomes Assessment and Use of Assessment for Program Improvement.....	10
Resources and Support.....	12
Students' Challenges and Characteristics, Ability to Serve the Program's Students.....	15
Conclusion: Summary and Action Plan.....	17

## **INTRODUCTION**

The external review of the Global Studies program of Sonoma State University was conducted by Dr. Matthew Derrick. An associate professor at Humboldt State University, Derrick is chair of that campus' Department of Geography, Environment, and Spatial Analysis as well as the program leader of International Studies. The reviewer benefitted from the hospitality and openness provided during his virtual visit (via Zoom) to Global Studies at SSU, which was a very informative window into the program, its context, its successes, and its opportunities. The Program Review Self Study 2020, completed last fall by Dr. Rheyna Laney, presented an honest appraisal of the current state of the department and was consistent with the input the external reviewer received from administrators, faculty, and students. The various constituencies' openness both made the reviewer's job easier and offers promise for the program's future.

During his visit, Derrick met with the department program leader and its steering committee, and a separate group of six undergraduate seniors. He met with Hope Ortiz, Global Engagement coordinator and International and Exchange Programs advisor. He also had separate meetings with Dean Troi and Vice Provost of Academic Affairs Stacey Bosick.

The Program Review Self Study, delivered to Derrick well ahead of his virtual visit, served as a very useful starting point for discussions with faculty and students. He asked interviewees to reflect on the strengths and challenges of the department and on opportunities for improvement and change. Many questions revolved around future plans and the next steps the program might take to build upon its present strengths and address challenges and opportunities associated with the program's curriculum and its situation in larger institutional and regional contexts. Special attention was dedicated to self-identified weaknesses and concerns, including curriculum coherence and robustness, shortcomings of its internship requirement, the decreasing presence of globally oriented faculty on campus, and the trend of declining student enrollments.

## OVERVIEW

SSU's Global Studies program has much to recommend itself. First, it is one of the few interdisciplinary programs on campus, encompassing courses selected from departments across the School of Social Sciences and Arts and Humanities. This type of interdisciplinarity—in addition to making the program cost-efficient, instills Global Studies majors with a multi-perspectival, holistic approach to analyzing complex global issues. Second, the program's facilitation of study abroad experiences and requirement of intermediate-level proficiency in a language promote cross-cultural acumen, which is not only valued in the marketplace but also critically important in navigating social spheres in era of high globalization. Third, the requirement to participate in an internship—applying classroom learning and further developing cross-culturalism—helps prepare students to pursue meaningful careers.

The Global Studies program was last reviewed in the 2008-09 academic year. The resultant MOU commended the program for its adherence to national standards set by similar programs, its emphasis on study abroad and real-world experience, its growth in major counts, and its well-functioning steering committee. The MOU, however, identified a longer list of concerns as well as an Action Plan. As a response to concerns arising from the 2008-09 program review, several actions were undertaken to improve Global Studies. Notable positive changes include the following: drafting new PLOs, overhauling the Senior Capstone Thesis course, adding an e-portfolio major requirement, and improving the senior exit survey. These changes, which are further addressed in subsequent sections of this report, have contributed to lasting enhancements in curricular alignment and program assessment.

Examples positive action coming out of the 2008-09 program review, however, have been offset by instances of inaction or counteraction that *in toto* undermine the health of Global Studies. Among the most consequential are the following:

1. Whereas the 2008-09 MOU recommended that the steering committee be expanded to maintain broad faculty representation, it *de facto* has been disbanded.
2. The MOU's recommendation to leverage programmatic the needs of both Geography and Global Studies, which had merged in 2005 to form the Department of Geography and Global Studies, to lobby for together a new hire came to naught.

3. The recommendation of adding an Asian language to the Modern Languages Department to bolster student options has gained no traction—Spanish, French, and German remain the options at SSU to fulfill the Global Studies language requirement.
4. The final recommendation was to revive the Global and International Education Committee and link it to a top administrator—it has not been enacted.

By way of approaching conclusion of this Overview and guiding reading of following sections, I offer the following observation: Whereas the examples of enduring positive action taken over the past decade were listed in the MOU as “Action that can be taken utilizing existing resources,” three of four instances of inaction identified above were listed as “Actions that can be taken only with resources identified outside the school.” The small core of leadership in Global Studies leadership have been impressively proactive in following through and making changes that are *within their control*. The examples of inaction, however, are more structural, dependent on decisions made at higher levels in the University. These decisions have had downstream, cumulative effects that further undermine Global Studies. Take, for example, point two above: Geography’s decision not to pursue a new hire with Global Studies. In depriving the program of an additional faculty member dedicated to globally oriented teaching and research, this example inaction set the stage for the 2017 decision to merge the Department of Geography and Global Studies with the Department of Environmental Studies and Planning, resulting the Department of Geography, Environment, and Planning (GEP). Global Studies is now housed and governed by GEP, consideration of its programmatic needs overshadowed the prioritization of enhancing a domestic-oriented environment-based curriculum.

The repositioning of Global Studies in the 2017 departmental reorganization is intertwined with other higher-level decision-making—including points three and four above—that adds up to broader retreat from international education at SSU. Some of the consequences for Global Studies, as addressed in subsequent sections, include diminished concentration options and other parts of its curriculum, reduced faculty affiliation and involvement (beyond a dedicated core), and a troubling decade-long downward trend in majors. This report’s examination of these and other challenges is accompanied by a set of recommendations, which, it should be noted, were arrived at in frank, open discussion with key stakeholders—students, faculty, staff, and administrators—in the Global Studies program.

## CURRICULUM COHERENCY AND CURRENCY

SSU's curriculum is structured in a coherent manner that helps maximize existing courses the Schools of Social Science and Arts and Humanities, drawing on expertise across the campus. It is comprised of six parts, each of which I provide an assessment of its coherency and currency:

1. The two-year **language requirement**, preparing students for work in multicultural contexts, *in alignment* with other similar programs in California and across the United States. Students found this an attractive component of the program. However, several expressed frustrations in the limited number of non-English languages offerings: Spanish, French, and German. When asked which language they would like to see at SSU, they were almost unanimous in answering Chinese, while support for Russian and Arabic was voiced as well.
2. The **foundation** ensures breadth of learning, exploring cultural, environmental, historical, political, and religious/ethical issues from multiple disciplinary perspectives. Synthetization of these five areas is undertaken in GEP 305: World Regions in Global Context. The layered interdisciplinary structure of Global Studies is *in alignment* with other similar programs.

However, as noted in the self-study review, the foundation is not fully aligned in that it lacks any kind of **economics** course. This was not the case at the time of the 2008-09 program review, when three courses from three separate disciplines were offered for the Global Economy and Business foundation requirement. In 2014-15, the three courses gave way to a lone class in macroeconomics, which, as described in the self-study review, centered on the United States; the course, for reasons discussed in the self-study review, was dropped. The foundation requirement for Globalization and Its Social Impact has followed a similar trajectory, the number of course offerings falling until the requirement was pulled.

The elimination of the two foundation areas, first, provides some illustration of general retreat from global/international education mentioned in the Overview. Second, it shines light on significant drawback to multidisciplinary programs: They rely on the other departments and programs whose interests and ambitions may coincide at on point and then diverge, or certain classes may be associated with a certain faculty member and go

away upon said faculty retirement. The vulnerability of relying on the good will of other departments has been illustrated in recent years with the difficulties Global Studies students face when attempting to fulfill the requirements for Political Ideas and Institutions. All three courses in the area are based in Political Science, which, as was explained to me, maintain comparatively low caps on its upper-division courses, giving enrollment preference to their majors. This leads to a situation in which Global Studies students, including several who spoke with me, often are unable to enroll in courses for this foundation requirement.

**Concentrations**, providing depth in a student's chosen area of expertise, are commonly found in other similar programs, though many do not feature concentration areas. Hence, in respect to concentration areas constituting part of its curriculum, Global Studies at SSU is *neither in nor out of alignment*. Yet reasons for concern exist. In 2008-09, there existed five concentration areas: two thematic options (Economic, Political, and Social Development, and Global Environmental Policy) and three regional options (Latin America, Europe, Asia). All five concentrations were listed in the 2014-15 curriculum, though the regional offerings had become irregular. Today, the Global Studies program has only two concentrations: Development and Area Studies through Study Abroad.

The changes over time to the concentrations in Global studies provide illustration of two key points. First, the erosion and eventually offshoring of regional concentrations provides additional evidence, laid out in the Program Review Self Study 2020, of the campus-wide retreat from global engagement. Second, the elimination of the Global Environmental Policy concentration, occurring in the wake of the 2017 departmental reorganization that produced GEP, itself part of the retreat, signals some marginalization of Global Studies within the department housing it.

3. The **cross-cultural experience**, which can be fulfilled through study abroad or internship, is a common feature in many similar programs, but many do not have the requirement. Hence, in this respect, Global Studies at SSU is *neither in nor out of alignment*.
4. The **internship** is also part of many similar programs, but also lacking in many other. Hence, in this respect, Global Studies at SSU is *neither in nor out of alignment*.

5. The **capstone project**, based on recommendations coming out of the last program review, has undergone a major redesign, as detailed in the Program Review Self Study 2020. Perhaps most notable is that the capstone project has been expanded a full academic year (two consecutive semester), the first focusing on research methods and the second devoted to carrying out an original research project. The current self-study review classifies the yearlong capstone project as *in alignment* with other programs, noting however that the content of the first semester (research design and methods) is generally covered earlier (commonly first semester of junior year) in the major.

In my experience, the two-course model, with the research methods-oriented course generally taken a year in advance, is not only far more common, but also more effective. Students apply and develop their research design skills to other course work as they gain experience and confidence in the build up to their Senior Capstone, generally taken during the final semester of their senior year. In this respect, I would push back a little against the assertion that the program is in alignment with other similar programs.

As a final note on the coherence and currency of program's curriculum, I will note a significant lacuna: **Introduction to Global Studies**. Such a course is staple in most Global or International Studies programs, yet absent in Global Studies at SSU. Hence, in this respect, the program is *out of alignment* with other similar programs, as acknowledged in the Program Review Self Study 2020. At the time of the 2008-09 program review, a course titled Introduction to Global Studies (GLBL 200) existed. However, for reasons detailed in the current self-study review, the course underwent a transformation and then disappeared. My recommendation is that an Introduction to Global Studies course be restored for at least three reasons. First, it would provide students with a clearer understanding of what Global Studies encapsulates. Second, it would help develop critical thinking skills and analytical lenses specific to the major. Third, an Introduction to Global Studies course would serve an important function in facilitating cohort building, feelings of belonging and engagement that contribute to greater retention and success rates. Indeed, the Global Studies students I talked agreed that a distinct feeling of belonging was lacking in the program. They collectively noted that they only became cognizant of belonging to a cohort in the first semester of the yearlong Senior Capstone.



## RELEVANCE AND CLARITY OF LEARNING OUTCOMES AND INTEGRATION WITH CURRICULUM

Following recommendations coming out of the last program review, Global Studies completely overhauled their PLOs, based off WASC four core competencies: Knowledge, Analysis, Communication, and Experience. The program has ensured its PLO align with curriculum and courses using three methods:

1. **Program Coordinator** aligns SLOs with PLOs for GLOBL-designated core cores, creating a curriculum map.
2. **Student Exit Surveys** measure alignment of core courses with program as a whole, a process alerts the steering committee of any potentially problematic courses offered in other departments. This process brought resulted in the elimination of ECON 204 from the curriculum (for explanation, see Program Review Self Study 2020, p. 14). Though agreeing with the decision eliminate ECON 204, I think it is important some study of economics be reintroduced in the curriculum.
3. **Indirect Assessment** of course syllabi with PLOs 1-3 is conducted by steering committee. The process illustrates that, while PLOs 1-2 (Knowledge, Analysis) are being met throughout the curriculum, PLO 3 (Communication) is not met in most of the curriculum. I agree with the self-study review suggestion that the program strengthen communication and collaboration in its curriculum. I see three approaches: (1) search for points where communication and collaboration skills might be developed GLOBL-designated courses, (2) identify courses outside GLOBL lacking communication- and/or collaboration-developing skills and speak with department chairs and/or instructors to see how and if courses might be modified to help the Global Studies curriculum better meet PLO 3, and (3) design a new Introduction to Global Studies course to facilitate the development of communication and collaboration skills.

A real strength of the Global Studies curriculum is its requirement that majors participate in a **community service internship**. This requirement, based on a list of eight requirements for the internship, ensures that PLO 4 (Experience) is met.

## MEANINGFULNESS AND EFFECTIVENESS OF LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT AND USE OF ASSESSMENT FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

Global Studies employs multiple methods for measure the effectiveness and learning outcomes, as described in the previous section. The thoroughness exhibited in part IV (Assessment) of the Program Review Self Study 2020 reveals a real seriousness on the part of Global Studies for assessment-driven program improvement. The steering committee has been methodical in identifying specific courses to assess specific PLOs, based on its **Program Curriculum Map**. Assessment of PLOs 1-3 suggests the curriculum is falling short in two areas:

1. “[T]he program needs to start developing analytical skills earlier and more deeply” (Self Study, p. 18). This finding provides for evidence for need an Introduction to Global Studies course.
2. “The program needs to develop stronger writing skills” (Self Study 2020, p. 19). See my commentary in the previous section.

While the first program goal (Academic, PLOs 1-3) for the most part is being met, the steering committee has identified issues with program goals two and three:

- **Program Goal 2.** Students have a profound cross-cultural experience that deepens their understanding of others, strengthens their communication skills, and increases their confidence in living and working in a cross-cultural context.
- **Program Goal 3.** Students are prepared to pursue their career aspirations.

These programs goals together align with PLO 4 (Experience). Feedback on student exit surveys as well from focus-group interviews with students “exposed a consistent set of concerns/frustrations around certain criteria for acceptable internships” (Self Study 2020, p. 21). At question is the program’s rigorous criteria for the internships:

- Work abroad if they intend to pursue an internationally oriented career.
- Have direct contact with the clients of the agency.
- Do work that is not primarily clerical or logistical.
- Use a language other than English.

Student frustrations centered on two issues. First, while many students want to conduct their internships abroad, many also expressed concerns over affordability. This issue should be taken seriously, as it involves questions of equity—work or study abroad requirements may price some students out of pursuing a degree in Global Studies. Also, as globalization scholars have illustrated, the socio-spatial separation of home and abroad does not hold up in the twenty-first century. Multicultural internship experiences, even for those students who wish to pursue careers taking them beyond the borders of the United States, should not be difficult to find in locally and even more so in the Bay Area. The steering committee can work with Global Studies students to be more imaginative in finding ways to experience authentic global-multicultural internships without taking on the onerous debt not rarely accompanies study and/or internship programs.

The second issue centers on the following: “Many want to pursue internships that are offered by government agencies or non-governmental organizations in US cities, such as Washington, DC or San Francisco” (Self Study 2020, p. 21). However, some steering committee members are concerned with such internships because they often are clerical or logistical, not involving direct interact contact with clients of the agency. Such concerns are valid, but paths to pursuing international careers in governmental agencies and NGOs commonly involve internships that do not meet the rigorous criteria currently in place in Global Studies. Students who seeking these types of internships, in my experience, most often are ambitious and have clear understanding of their career paths.

In sum, I would suggest the Global Studies consider revising the internship criteria to accommodate both issues discussed above. This would better accommodate the two types of student career paths: (1) those who want to work internationally, and those who want to “think globally but act locally” (Self Study 2020, p. 22), i.e., pursue a US-based career. Revisions to internship criteria can be made to better suit the two career paths without forfeiting rigor.

Assessment suggests a final concern that Global Studies is poorly aligned with the Peace Corps Prep program. First, Sonoma State should be proud it was invited to apply for the Peace Corps Prep program and its application was accepted, a fact that distinguishes it as one of only a handful of California campuses to feature the program. Global Studies should find ways to leverage the program through enhanced advertising and advising and consider linking the program’s curriculum where possible.

## **RESOURCES AND SUPPORT**

SSU's Global Studies program is a model of efficiency. Efficiency as necessity, as its funding model changed from one of being independently funded independently to one in which, with the 2017 departmental reorganization, it is funded via a limited allotment of WTUs through GEP. This change has contributed to a management structure in which duties (advising, committees, etc.) were distributed among a cadre of faculty from the Schools Social Sciences and Arts and Humanities to one in which Global Studies coordinator is allotted four WTUs to manage the program. The 2017 departmental restructuring, leading to marginalized position of Global Studies, may be limiting factor in terms of resource distribution to the program's overall health.

### ***Faculty Resources***

The three-person steering committee form the core of Global Studies. Two are faculty in GEP, including Drs. Rheyne Laney, who is the program manager, and Jeff Baldwin. Third is John Nardine, who, as a lecturer with a three-year contract, teaches three GLBL-designated courses. The trio deserves applause for its dedication to maintaining high standards, with limited resources, in Global Studies. Yet this arrangement carries pitfalls. First, Laney performs a great load in administration, teaching, advising, outreach, and other multiple other duties necessary to keep Global Studies afloat; this tantamount to carrying the fate of program largely—and likely unduly—on her shoulders alone. Second, assigning the teaching all GLBL-designated courses to a single lecturer contributes to potential long-term structural instability for the program. Third, Laney and Baldwin both teach courses in Global Studies; they nonetheless remain GEP faculty and therefore, in the final account, are beholden to the interests of that department, which, as previously indicated, has invested itself ramping up study of the environment. Indeed, several Global Studies students said that study of the environment already seems too pronounced in the program. With Baldwin preparing to move to halftime, the question of diversity in course offerings becomes even more fraught for Global Studies.

Beyond its core faculty, as an interdisciplinary program, Global Studies relies on faculty across the Social Sciences and Arts and Humanities in two ways. First is to teach a wide range of courses that constitute the Global Studies curriculum. Second is to serve as “readers” for Global Studies students' capstone projects. This arrangement offers significant benefits in terms of cost efficiency and providing multiple perspectives in Global Studies. However, as the experience

SSU's Global Studies illustrates, relying so heavily on faculty from multiple departments across the campus also carries inherent instabilities that can adversely impact curriculum coherence and currency—not only in terms of guaranteeing course continuity, but also in terms of student access. Global Studies has established protocols designed to secure access to courses with several departments. However, as discussed above in the Curriculum Coherence and Currency section, the current situation with Politics suggests that signing protocols, without the firm backing of administration, may not be effective.

Perhaps the most concerning dynamic in relying on faculty who spread across multiple departments and two schools is what has already been characterized as a camp-wide retreat from global engagement. Based on discussions with various stakeholders and close analysis of the self-study review, I strongly agree with the following statement from the review:

*Since GLBL has no power over faculty hiring decisions, the major needs leadership and commitment from a higher level, such as from the Dean or Provost. The University needs to encourage departments to hire globally-oriented faculty. Otherwise, the University as a whole will falter in its **Strategic Priority #3**, which is to cultivate leaders who will build a better society both locally and **globally** (Self Study 2020, p. 27).*

### ***Program Resources***

Advising in Global Studies is multifaceted and complex. The program leader, who administers academic advising for all Global Studies majors, faces the daunting task of staying abreast with developments in multiple departments and personalities involved in the program while addressing queries about study abroad options (or fielding questions from students while they are abroad), career planning, and other questions that may lie outside her purview. The program leader's basket of duties has been lightened some with the creation of GLBL 310: Professional Development, a two-unit course in which students explore careers paths, work on resumes, and other aspects of professional development.

### ***Campus Support***

Global Studies faculty are concerned that a key feature of the Global Studies program—the required community service internship—may be weakened by a new SSU internship policy that is in development. As stated in the self-study review,

*We are very concerned about the future of GLBL internships under this new policy. Our main concern centers on the new standards concerning liability/risk management coverage. It is quite possible that the vast majority of internships that GLBL majors have participated in in the past will no longer be eligible (Self Study 2020, p. 28).*

New liability/risk management coverage requirement could jeopardize internship opportunities abroad, negatively affecting high-impact real-world experience that are a hallmark of the program and remain popular among Global Studies majors.

In addition to support in negotiating the university's new internship policy, Global Studies would benefit from support in three other areas:

1. **Advising, Career and Orientation Services:** Global Studies needs help increasing the visibility of the major to new and undeclared students.
2. **Transition and Transfer Programs:** Global Studies needs help making sure that all community colleges are aware of the major and have up-to-date information on articulations with the program.
3. **Financial Support:** In the name of equity, Global Studies needs help in providing scholarships for low-income students for (A) study abroad and (B) international internships.

## **STUDENTS' CHALLENGES AND CHARACTERISTICS, ABILITY TO SERVE THE PROGRAM'S STUDENTS**

The Program Review Self Study 2020, drawing on analysis of student exit survey data and institutional data, provides insight into the characteristics of Global Studies majors. Students identify two main reasons for deciding to pursue a bachelor's degree in Global Studies:

1. **Interest in the world:** Desire to understand the world from global vantage point (34%)
2. **Academic approach:** Cross-disciplinary perspective, holistic view (24%)

These are the very foundations of the program, which, without intentionality in support from the administration, could be undermined. So, as a refrain of sorts, I offer the following cautions: The campus-wide retreat from global engagement narrows the global vantage point; and certain departments of limiting access to—or *de facto* eliminating—courses in the Global Studies curriculum undermines the program's cross-disciplinarity and holism.

Comparatively low rates for other factors speak to questions brought up earlier about the program. First, consider the following: About 20 percent of the respondents identified a desire to pursue an international career, and another 20 percent identified facilitation of study abroad as reasons for declaring a major (only 8 percent identified a fondness of travel). These comparatively low figures provide additional support for the recommendation that criteria for internships be reimagined for greater flexibility to accommodate Global Studies majors, a majority, it appears, wanting to think globally while acting locally.

The most concerning characteristic of Global Studies student characteristics needs addressed from the outstart: the dangerously low number of majors. The program boasted 87 majors in 2011, but the number had fallen to 33 in 2018, a fall-off 62 percent in seven years. These numbers are troubling, but slightly less so when compared at trends at Humboldt State University, where International Studies majors fell from 109 in 2011 to 37 in 2018, a drop of 66 percent over the same period. Moreover, after a sharp drop between in 2014, which coincides with the elimination of GLBL 200 from the curriculum, majors in Global Studies at SSU held relatively steady, even increasing in 2015 and 2016, before dropping 33 percent in 2017. This dramatic drop, after year-on-year increases, coincides with the formation of GEP, which

provides some evidence of a departmental reorganization contributing to Global Studies under-prioritization.

The self-study review offers four reasons that might explain the decline in majors, three related to “visibility” and one related to “messaging.” While not disagreeing that the program could benefit from greater exposure online, at the career center, and elsewhere, and new messaging might be crafted to appeal to students who want to “think globally, but act globally,” evidence suggests other factors may offers greater explanation of the declines. Two are touched on earlier in this section: (1) departmental reorganization and (2) the elimination of the only lower-division GLBL course, a *GE course* at that. These and other factors reappear in the following section (Conclusion: Summary and Action Plan).



## CONCLUSION: SUMMARY AND ACTION PLAN

The Program Review Self Study outlines table summaries of Global Studies' (A) strengths and successes and (B) weaknesses and concerns. I cannot help but agree with the list of strengths and successes (Self Study 2020, p. 39), though with a couple caveats. First, however, I offer the core faculty's generosity and dedication as perhaps the program's greatest strengths. The trio of Laney, Baldwin, and Nardine accomplish quite a bit with quite limited resources—they deserve applause. The bulk of the contributing faculty spread across two schools and multiple departments doubtlessly deserve praise as well. However, while the curriculum leverages globally oriented faculty expertise across SSU, as a **first caveat**, I point out that some of said expertise is being withheld from Global Studies majors, who are often unable to enroll in Politics classes due to the practice—in effect abrogating protocol agreements—of giving first shot at seat, which are already comparatively limited by the department, to its own majors.

This leads to my **first recommendation**: *Administration should be proactive in ensuring that seats remain open in key courses for Global Studies students.*

The following is also recognized as a strength: “The capstone project solidifies strong analytical, collaborative and problem-solving skills” (Self Study 2020, p. 39). Indeed, overhauling the capstone project—making it a yearlong experience, the first semester consisting of methods and the second on carrying out research—was among the program's most successful changes. However, as a **second caveat**, in my experience, the two-course model, with the research methods-oriented course generally taken a year in advance, is not only far more common, but also more effective. Students apply and develop their research design skills to other course work as they gain experience and confidence in the build up to their Senior Capstone, generally taken during the final semester of their senior year.

Thus, my **second recommendation**: *Split the yearlong Senior Capstone up, offering the first semester—based on research methods—at the 300 level. Not only would students be able to begin applying research methods to coursework ahead of their Senior Capstone, that this GLBL-listed course would appear a year early, student cohort-building would be enhanced.*

The list of weaknesses and concerns seems appropriate to me, as well does most of the Action Plan. The bulk of the Action Plan is dedicated to curricular concerns. **Recommendation:**

First, yes, a 300-level GLBL-listed *Introduction to Global Studies* should be reintroduced—as a GE Area D course—should be reintroduced. The GE designation would allow for some degree of recruitment, while the Area D designation would allow for the quality of analysis and writing development assessment suggests is needed in the curriculum, as well as facilitate cohort development earlier in the program. **Recommendation:** *Moving the Research Methods in Global Studies course down to the 300 level would also allow for earlier development of analysis and writing development.* And both classes could include some elements of oral communication and collaboration, thereby helping to develop those skills as well without adding another course, such as the proposed SSCI 229: Thinking Like a Social Scientist (I do not see the addition of this course as being necessary).

**Recommendation:** *Consider adding two additional courses: (1) Global Economy, which could serve multiple social science courses, as indicated in the self-study report; and (2) a 100-level GE, the area—A or E—is not too important, because it would serve more as a recruitment course for Global Studies.* The administrators I spoke, especially Dean Troi, to seemed support this idea.

**Recommendation:** *In full agreement with strengthening its internship program, I would suggest the Global Studies consider revising the internship criteria to accommodate both frustrations in previously.* This would better accommodate the two types of student career paths: (1) those who want to work internationally, and those who want to “think globally but act locally” (Self Study 2020, p. 22), i.e., pursue a US-based career. Revisions to internship criteria can be made to better suit the two career paths without forfeiting rigor.

Assessment suggests a final concern that Global Studies is poorly aligned with the Peace Corps Prep program. First, Sonoma State should be proud it was invited to apply for the Peace Corps Prep program and its application was accepted, a fact that distinguishes it as one of only a handful of California campuses to feature the program. **Recommendation:** *Global Studies should find ways to leverage the program through enhanced advertising and advising and consider linking the program’s curriculum where possible.*

By way of concluding this report, I offer two final large-scale recommendation. **Recommendation 1:** *Reverse dynamic that has been addressed multiple times in this report is the retreat of global expertise and engagement on campus.* This is not something Global Studies can

hope to do, even in the slightest, on its own. Globalizing the SSU campus requires will power and action from key administrators, including Dean Troi and Vice Provost of Academic Affairs Stacey Bosick.

***Recommendation 2: Create a collaborative consortium of North Coast CSU***

*Global/International Studies programs, an alliance that would include Humboldt State, Sonoma State, and San Francisco State.* All three programs face problems of robustness. For Sonoma and Humboldt, it is the ability to fill Chinese-language courses on their own. Together, possibly with San Francisco State, a solid two or three years of Chinese could be offered. And limited the consortium to three campuses, relatively close in location, would help ensure greater equity in course distribution, credit, and quality assurance. Strengthening Chinese would be a starting point, then we could take inventories of each campuses strengths, looking for opportunities for collaboration and cooperation that are mutually beneficial,.