**Setting: Yale and Federal Title 6, International Education**

Yale’s MacMillan Center implemented a comprehensive assessment of international education resources and outcomes for Yale graduate, professional, and undergraduate students 2001-2015. Designed with the Office of Institutional Research, five area councils executed a common plan (Africa, East Asia, Europe, Latin America and Middle East) with federal Title 6 NRC-FLAS grant funds. Led by Dr. Nancy Ruther, Associate Director of MCMC and expert in Title 6 policy and programs, the assessment was designed as a 15-year case study of Yale which has been a continuous competitor for Title 6 grants, both awarded and lost, since the 1960s.

**Higher Education Context: Beyond Global Citizenship to Expertise**

- Global citizenship is a necessary but insufficient goal for international higher education nationwide.
  - Internationalization of higher education focuses heavily on undergraduates and study abroad to achieve cross-cultural skills outcomes. Language skills are too often downplayed, perniciously signaling that English is sufficient. Most assessment focuses on individual students.
  - As an internationalization strategy, study abroad misses 90% of US college graduates and virtually all graduate students. Mobility is important but not sufficient to meet the need for global skills.
  - There is a growing movement to focus on “internationalization of the curriculum” where all students can participate. Developing pathways to expertise and workforce/career links can follow.
- “Back to the Future”: curriculum and expertise as federal model for international higher education
  - Title 6 has had laser focus for 60 years on three critical elements – interdisciplinary curriculum, language skills and workforce outcomes. Its assessment focused on inputs and neglected outcomes.
  - Yale adapted the Title 6 model to produce strong pathways to expertise, using Area Studies Councils to flexibly develop skills for all levels of students with paths from generalist to top expertise levels.
  - This case study tested the model and revealed high value outcomes for Yale and national policy goals and most importantly for students – undergraduates, MA and professional school degrees and PhDs.

**Key Findings: High Value Outcomes**

**Student outcomes:** International “specialist” students clearly stand out from their peers.
- After graduation in their plans for the future and actual lives and careers:
  - More likely to plan to and actually use foreign languages in their work.
  - More likely to pursue international careers, especially in government or education.
- During their studies in their utilization of and demand for International, Area, and Foreign Language (IAFL) resources:
  - Start with more and higher levels of foreign language proficiency, gain more and lose less.
  - More likely to pursue critical and least commonly taught languages.
  - Show greater demand for international travel resources to support their studies.

**Curricular resources:** IAFL courses were strong (≥ 25% content).
- Yale’s IAFL curricular resources were very stable, with some growth 2001-14, the years analyzed.
- Yearly variation by region and in “high-content” and language courses raises a “yellow flag.”

**Title 6 policy results:** The T6 NRC area studies model succeeded at Yale. It produced the desired curricular inputs, high level of student engagement across many fields and units, and graduates with desired expertise that they used in work in priority employment sectors of education and government.

**Institutional Lessons**

- “If you build it, they will come.” Yale’s area studies councils serve as faculty research and teaching hubs, primarily arts and sciences along with professional schools. Together, they sustain IAFL curricular resources to train BA and MA “specialists” in their world regions and languages. Plus, they ensure extracurricular resources, e.g. travel, graduate certificates, lectures, workshops, conferences open to students, BA through PhD University wide.
- The value proposition is strong. Title 6 gets its money’s worth. So does Yale.
  - The “shadow” specialists, e.g. a BA in History with substantial area courses and language skills,
use the area hubs’ specialist resources to pursue a path to area expertise in their home degree field.  
• In “budget battles,” the area studies hubs clearly support many more than their BA and MA IAFL specialist students. A large bloom of 30-70% of other BA, PhD and Professional degree students, pursue IAFL expertise as “shadow specialists,” e.g. MS Environmental Studies or Public Health,
◆ The assessment design measures what matters. It connects the dots from resources to outcomes for IAFL education, showing how students tap the area hubs’ resources and use them in their studies to develop key skills and how they deploy them in their post-graduate careers and lives.

“HIGH VALUE OUTCOMES” ASSESSMENT – FUTURE USES  
◆ Yale as case study: journal article, recruiting IAFL-specializing students, fund-raising, publicity.
◆ Solo campus: regular institutional research tool guiding internationalization strategy, identifying gaps and strengths in curricular and related resources, engagement and outcomes over time.
◆ Multi-campus comparison: valuable benchmarks for Yale and rigorous test of assessment design.
◆ T6 NRC-FLAS campus comparison: demonstrate variations in the effectiveness of federal policy under different campus conditions. (Why was Yale such a highly effective example of T6?).  
◆ Internationalization assessment platforms of ACE, AACU, etc.: Beyond individual cross-cultural indicators and institutional process, integrate curriculum strength, outcome measures and language expertise into IAFL assessment tools; add graduate students into evaluation designs.

THE ASSESSMENT TOOLKIT: FOCUS ON FOUR BASIC QUESTIONS  
◆ Linkage: How well did Yale’s resources support students’ development of IAFL skills and expertise?  
• All Yale courses tagged by % of international content (≥ 25%) (2001-2014)
◆ Engagement: How did students engage Yale’s IAFL resources?  
• Enrollments by level of student and world region and international issues focus (2001-2012)  
• Transcript analysis for undergraduates (2001-2012 years)  
• Graduate student survey at time of graduation (yearly 2012,’13,’14,’15 , MacMillan MA’s, PhD’s, Forestry & Environmental Studies, Public Health, Management, Law)  
  o use of curriculum with cross-checking question, including language study  
  o application for competitive travel funds
◆ Outcome: What proportion of Yale students graduated with IAFL skills and expertise?  
• Specialized degree graduates, e. g., BA or MA in International or Area Studies, Foreign Language,  
• Transcript analysis of undergraduates (10 years): “shadow major” ≥ 10 eligible courses and “shadow minor” 5-9 eligible courses without elementary or intermediate language courses  
• Survey of graduate students at time of graduation (yearly 2012-15, 4 years)  
  o gain/loss of language skill and languages used/studied to what level during degree  
  o actual travel in pursuit of studies for 4 weeks or longer
◆ Utilization/Impact: How did students and graduates plan to and actually use their IAFL skills over time?  
• Alumni analysis “specialist” BA’s, MA’s, T6 priority jobs, location in the US or overseas (2001-12)  
• Survey of graduates 5 and 10 years post-graduation (BA, MA and PhD); most reliable for BA’s and for actual use of foreign language studied and used in work (pilot 2011, one time 2012)  
• Survey of graduate students at time of graduation (yearly 2012-15): questions on plans to use skills and sector of employment and likely location post-graduation, cross-checked

If you would like to learn more about this model, tools or the findings, please contact me. I would be pleased to explore ways to obtain truly high value outcomes in your international education programs.

Nancy Ruther, Principal, Gazelle International  
MacMillan Center Associate Director and Lecturer (retired)  
nancyruther@gazelle-international.org or nancy.ruther@yale.edu