

## Chicanx-Latinx Studies Assessment Report: AY 2021-2022

- Chicanx-Latinx Studies (Minor)
- *Organizers of Assessment Process*

Christina Garcia Lopez, director [cglopez3@usfca.edu](mailto:cglopez3@usfca.edu)

Nicole Gonzales-Howell, board member [ncgonzaleshowell@usfca.edu](mailto:ncgonzaleshowell@usfca.edu)

- *Your Mission Statement; note any changes since last report*

Chicanx-Latinx Studies prepares students for informed political action and justice work with and within Chicanx and Latinx communities. The program is based on the recognition of the country's growing Latinx communities and their historical role in the fight for decolonization, re-definitions of nationhood and citizenship, as well as their broader struggles and interconnections across the Americas. Students are introduced to major theories and perspectives on the cultural, socio-economic, and political issues affecting Chicanx and Latinx populations in the United States. Through the program, students come to understand how structures of race, class, gender, sexuality, and ideology condition inequality and social conflict. Students develop the skills necessary for professional and graduate work in areas such as social work, education, business, health sciences, the arts and humanities, law, and management.

[Change: We have changed the @ to x]

- *Your PLOs; note any changes since last report*

PLO1. Comparatively analyze social, economic, and/or political forces shaping the historical experiences of Chicanx and Latinx communities through academic contexts.

PLO2. Students can read and write academically and intellectually sophisticated texts that analyze issues relating to Chicanx and Latinx communities.

PLO3. Students can describe, appraise, and criticize master narratives from popular, scholarly, and/or civic discourse that often perpetuate systemic inequalities especially as they relate to the Chicanx and Latinx populations.

PLO4. Students can summarize and critically assess current social, political, and economic issues that affect Chicanx and Latinx Studies.

- *Your current Curricular Map; note any changes since last report*  
[Please see attachment]

- *Your assessment schedule between APRs: a year by year list of PLOs assessed since your last APR and those to be assessed before your next APR*

We have not had an APR, as a minor program; however, below is our assessment schedule, at least since I have been director. Now that we have assessed all 4 PLOs, we may want to plan to do PLO2 next year, as that was last assessed for AY 2016-2017.

2016-2017: PLO2

2017-2018: PLO4

2018-2019: PLO1

2019-2020: Alternative Reflection

2020-2021: Year of Reflection

2021-2022: PLO3

- *Description of the assessment methodology*

Noting that we needed to assess PLO #3, I determined that while a few different courses might offer applicable work samples, the most ideal course would be SOC 218 Latinx Culture & Society, which is our “core required” course for the minor. Though, due to the fact that it is not offered every semester, we do often substitute this course for certain other courses, it does remain the course we would like all of our minors to take. In Fall 2021, this course was taught by Marco Durazo, who kindly supplied the midterm for us to assess after I specified the particular PLO we were interested in assessing.

I drafted a rubric (see below), breaking PLO #3 into separate parts (description, appraisal, and criticism) so that it would be easier to assess. In terms of scoring each category, CLS board member Nicole Gonzales Howell suggested that samples “needing improvement” could be valued at 1 point, those “satisfactorily meeting expectations” would merit 2 points, and those deemed “above average” in a category would be scored 3 points. Since there are 3 categories, this means that, *theoretically*, the lowest scoring sample would receive a 3 (with a 1 in each of the 3 categories), and the highest scoring sample would receive a 9 (with a 3 in each category). And accordingly, a paper that meets expectations in all 3 categories would receive a score of 6; this would be the baseline that we would hope our students would meet on average.

Next, Prof. Gonzalez Howell and I determined to randomize the 28 papers by assessing every other paper, which came to 14. To be clear, Prof. Gonzales Howell and I would both read and assessed the *same* 14 papers. Then, we conducted a norming process in which we each read and scored papers 1, 2, and 3 and discussed our rationales for the scores we individually assigned to each of them. After reading and scoring, we would discuss our scores before moving onto the next paper. This gave us both a clear sense of the standards we should use to assess each category. We determined that “description” of master narratives was the most basic level, suggesting an ability to name those narratives, whereas “appraisal” goes a step further, offering an evaluation of master narratives. Lastly, “critique” is the most complex of the three, as it requires some critical explanation or substantiation of that evaluation. Through the norming process, we were able to determine our baseline understanding of what we should be looking for in the work samples, and how to discern the difference between a 1, 2, or 3 for each relevant category. Then, we individually completed our scoring of all 14 papers, and input the scores into a table, for comparison.

- *Rubric*

PLO3	Needs improvement in One or More Areas to Meet Satisfactory Level (+1)	Meets Expectations to a Satisfactory Level (+2)	Surpasses Satisfactory Level, Above Average (+3)
Description of Master Narratives w/ clear relation to CL populations			
Appraisal of Master Narratives w/ clear relation to CL populations			
Criticism of Master Narratives w/ clear relation to CL populations			

*Scoring Sheet*

Essay #	Reader #1 (C)	Reader #2 (N)	
1	6	6	
2	5	4	
3	6	6	
4	6	9	
5	4	5	
6	8	6	
7	6	6	
8	6	9	
9	4	4	
10	6	4	
11	8	7	
12	9	5	
13	6	6	
14	5	5	
total	85	82	
individual avg	6.07	5.86	
			AVG 5.97

- *Description of your results, noting any significant findings from the data or assessment process*

After we each completed our scoring, I tallied each of our total scores, and then divided each total by 14 (the # of total papers) in order to determine the average score we each ended up with. Prof. Gonzalez Howell had a 5.86, which was slightly lower than my average of 6.07. Lastly, I averaged both of those together, in order to combine our scores, which came to a 5.97. As this score is only .03 points removed from the baseline score of 6 which we were hoping for, I would argue this assessment demonstrates that students in this class were able to satisfactorily meet expectations for this PLO by mid-semester. I would hypothesize that by the end of semester, students could rationally be expected to improve their skills to an even greater level. While the assignment upon which the work sample was based did not necessarily directly ask students to describe, appraise, and critique master narratives, students were nevertheless able to demonstrate these skills.

One important point is that, because this course is open to all students, the work samples presumably include both CLS minors and non-minors, or perhaps some students who may eventually become minors. So, one question that I have is whether we should hand select students that are minors, and assess their work in particular, or if it is enough to simply assess the courses that our students take, even if they are open to non-minors as well? This is something that I can survey our board members about. However, our findings do give us confidence that the classes our students are taking are equipping them with the skills to demonstrate the essentials of this PLO.

- *Description of how the results were shared with faculty and how your department/program responded to the results. This is where you should lay out any plans for future improvement or assessment of your program indicated by the results*

As we just wrapped up the assessment process, I have not yet shared the results with our board members. As soon as I submit this, I will forward this report to them and go over the results at our next CLS board meeting. Nicole and I can describe our process and method of assessment, as well as our findings, and survey the board members as to whether we should approach it similarly or differently in the future. For instance, one question we should put forth is whether the board agrees that it makes sense to continue to approach assessment by choosing a work product from a class that includes minors and non-minors, as we have done in the past, or if there is preference to pull work products from minors only, to make sure that we are tracking their learning only and in particular. Since we do not have any classes that are entirely composed of minors, that might be an awkward exercise, as it would likely involve pulling work products across different courses, which would mean they would be a bit scattered in terms of the assignments. Additionally, while we have determined through this assessment that students in SOC 218 are meeting expectations with respect to this PLO, we might also discuss ways we can incorporate this learning outcome more explicitly in some of our other courses as well. Can we incorporate language regarding “master narratives” in other assignments or exercises? What are some creative ways we could do this in the classroom as well? What are the ways we are already doing this, beyond formal assignments? These are all questions we can and should consider.

- Discussion of any significant feedback from your previous year's report and how your program responded to that feedback

We appreciated the positive reinforcement regarding our efforts to expand our course offerings; in fact, I am scheduled to teach a new course--Latinx Literature--this spring, which I feel will be an important offering, alongside the already existing course I teach, Introduction to Chicanx Literature. I am piloting it under the ENGL 202 Literary Works title, but hope to submit it for its own course number and C1 core designation if all goes well. Additionally, Michael Jonas mentioned in our last feedback report the possibility of the Economics department offering "Economies of Latin America" at some point in the future; indeed, we are always looking for more ways to expand our course offerings that can draw in students! We also appreciated the suggestions regarding indirect survey methods, i.e. asking students to 'self-assess,' which is something we had not given as much thought to, and indeed, we should consider how we might innovatively approach assessment in such ways. Lastly, I believe at last report, there was potential for CLS to merger with LAS; while that does not seem to be on the horizon at this juncture, there is some possibility that restructuring could occur in some form after the Critical Diversity Studies external review this year, as they may have some suggestions regarding what the relationship should be between the CDS major and the CLS minor. Overall, it is a milestone that we have been able to assess all of our PLOs since 2016, and can now look towards our future assessment strategies with that experience and foundation established!