

Annual Assessment Report Template AY22-23

Extension Granted: Friday, December 15, 2023, 2023

Report

- *Name of program and degree type assessed*
Critical Diversity Studies (Major)
- *Names and contact information of the faculty coordinating the assessment:*
Christina Garcia Lopez cglopez3@usfca.edu
- *Your Mission Statement; note any changes since last report*
CDS' stated mission is to "engage students in critical analyses of the social and historical construction of race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexualities, citizenship, religion, and other social categories and to explor[e] intersectionality and hybridities within and across these social categories as they constitute historical and contemporary U.S. culture as well as U.S.'s relationships with other countries."
- *Your PLOs; note any changes since last report*
PLO1: Analyze social, economic, and/or political forces that have shaped historically marginalized and underrepresented communities.
Old PLO 1: Comparatively analyze social, economic, and political forces shaping the historical experiences of diverse U.S. ethnic and racial communities through academic and/or service learning contexts. [This old PLO1 has been assessed 3 times]

PLO2: Articulate responses and/or solutions to systemic injustice.
Old PLO 2: Be prepared to work in diverse professional settings (e.g., careers in health, education, human resources, public policy, law, social work, non-profit, and for-profit organizational management).

PLO3: Compare the histories and experiences of multiple historically marginalized and underrepresented US groups, and appraise how these have influenced inter-group relationships. (originally this PLO was articulated as PLO 4, but in 2018 it was decided that the original PLO 3—see below—should be deleted)
Old PLO 3: Build upon the coursework in other academic programs where diversity expertise is especially useful (especially those who are double majoring in CDS and another major like Sociology, Education, or Urban 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.*

Our first program review took place quite recently, in Fall 2022. As shown by the list below, our program had only assessed 1 PLO, which is an outdated version of PLO1. It was assessed three separate times. Now that we have updated versions of our PLOs, we must work our way through them. I have started with PLO2, which has never been assessed. We can consider this a pilot year, as I do not have a full assessment team; thus, next year, the director can either assess PLO2 with a proper team, or move onto PLO3, and the following year, assess the new PLO1.

2016-2017—Old PLO1, using CD 100 (pre-requisite class) first year of assessment

2017-2018—Old PLO1, using CDS 400 (capstone)

2018-2019—Old PLO1, using CDS 100

2019-2020—Reflection Option

2020-2021—Year in Reflection

2021-2022—Self Study

2022-2023—PLO 2

- *Description of the assessment methodology*

Due to the nature of our current structure, every member of the advisory board is also a director of a minor (African American Studies, Asian Pacific American Studies, Gender & Sexuality Studies, Chicanx/Latinx Studies). This means that every member not only has their own minor program to assess, but potentially also may be involved in assessment processes for their home department. For this reason, it can be challenging to build an assessment team. Thus, my initial plan was to conduct another “Year of Reflection”; however, given that we have never assessed any version of PLOs 2 or 3, and given last year’s feedback, I felt it was better to create a pilot for assessing one of those PLOs, which would give me a chance to directly engage student work products.

I opted to focus on *PLO2. Articulate responses and/or solutions to systemic injustice* for two key reasons: 1) this PLO gets to the core of our program’s intentions in terms of what we want our students to learn, and 2) I had observed student capstone presentations the prior spring, thus having opportunity to learn about the work students had done relevant to this PLO. In S24, CDS 400 Capstone was taught by Professor Mana Hayakawa, and students had submitted their presentation slides to me for our capstone event, at which students publicly presented their projects. I determined that I could use the students’ presentation slides, in combination with their actual theses, to feasibly assess PLO2.

I next drafted a rubric for PLO2, breaking it down into 2 areas of criteria, the first focused on students' explanation of the systemic injustice of focus, and the second focused on articulation of solutions/responses. I then created 3 different gradations to assess the level to which students were meeting those areas of criteria (exceeds/ meets/ does not meet). Next, I collaborated with Nicole Gonzalez Howell, who is a CDS stakeholder, having previously taught for the major several times, including the Capstone class. Professor Gonzalez Howell provided very helpful feedback and possible revisions on the drafted rubric, which I gratefully integrated into the final version.

Next, I created a data table to input scores, labeling the 10 projects according to the "systemic injustice" the project focused on, and numbering them. Then, using the finalized rubric, I evaluated their archived presentation slides (which I had also seen in person when the event occurred last spring) and additionally referred to their written theses projects (sent to me by Professor Hayakawa) in order to ascertain a deeper understanding of the degree to which they achieved each criteria area. *Note:* 1 of the 10 projects, which I've asterisked, could only be evaluated based on presentation slides, as the student received an "Incomplete" and their presumably later submitted thesis was not included in the zip file of work samples.

Once I had all the scores input, I averaged each of the 2 individual criteria areas, as well as the overall scores. Although the overall score average is the central number sought in this case, I thought it might also be helpful to know how students did, on average, in each of the criteria areas.

- Assessment Rubric for PLO2. Articulate responses and/or solutions to systemic injustice

Criteria	3=Exceeds	2=Meets	1=Does Not Meet
Clearly explains the systemic injustice.	Explains the conditions/circumstances of injustice, specifying their systemic nature, in a complex way that demonstrates detail and deep understanding.	Adequately explains the conditions/circumstances of injustice and their systemic nature BUT does not demonstrate strong detail or depth of understanding.	Does not adequately explain both the conditions/circumstances of injustice AND what makes those conditions systemic.
Articulate responses and/or solutions to that stated injustice.	Responses and/or solutions to stated injustice are refined, reflective, and demonstrate prolonged study or consideration.	Offers general responses and/or solutions to stated systemic injustice but lacks evidence that is refined, reflective, and does not demonstrate prolonged study or consideration.	Does not go beyond articulating systemic injustice to offer any potential solutions or responses.

Scoring Table

AY 2022-2023 CDS Assessment Data Table				
File Edit View Insert Format Data Tools Extensions Help				
F11				
	A	B	C	D
1	Project	Criteria 1	Criteria 2	Total Score
2	1 Media Stereotypes of Black Women	3	2	5
3	2 Linguistic Colonization	3	3	6
4	3 Housing Insecurity/ Trans* Students	3	3	6
5	4* PWUD Individual Blame Models	2	2	4
6	5 Gendered Racism / Black Women	2	2	4
7	6 Uneven Educational Access/ Children with Disabilities	3	3	6
8	7 Imperialism/ Government Oppression in SWANA regions	3	3	6
9	8 Decreased Abortion Rights in US	3	1	4
10	9 Obstacles to Autonomy for Psychiatrically Disabled	3	2	5
11	10 Carceral Systems and Logics of Punishment	2	3	5
12		AVG 2.7 (out of 3)	AVG 2.4 (out of 3)	AVG 5.1 (out of 6)
13		90%	80%	85%
14				
15	Criteria 1: Clearly explains the systemic injustice.			
16	Criteria 2: Articulates responses and/or solutions to that stated injustice.			
17				
18	Project 4 could only be evaluated based on presentation slides, due to Incomplete			
19				

- *Description of your results, noting any significant findings from the data/assessment*
Based on my interpretations of the results, CDS seniors are, on average, working well above “meeting expectations” for PLO2. More specifically, the highest score possible (“exceeds expectations”) would be a 6, and “meeting expectations” in both criteria areas would be represented by a score of 4. As students’ total scores, across both criteria areas, average at 5.1 out of 6, it is reasonable to say that they articulate responses and/or solutions to systemic injustice at a rate of 85%.

Broken down by criteria area, if we look at criteria area 1 (“Clearly explains the systemic injustice”), we see that students fulfilled this at a rate of 90%. Next, if we examine criteria area 2 (“Articulate responses and/or solutions to that stated injustice”), we see that students fulfilled this at a rate of 80%. This suggest that while students are doing well in both criteria areas, they are more frequently successful at explaining systemic injustices than in offering solutions/responses. Of course, not every project is necessarily focused upon offering solutions, and that was not necessarily a requirement of the capstone project. Nevertheless, we see that by and far, the majority of CDS majors are completing capstone projects that do offer solutions/responses, as there was only 1 student out of 10 that did not include solutions in their project.

This assessment provides us tangible insight to: 1) the type of systemic injustices our seniors are self-selecting to focus on, 2) their level of depth in terms of explaining those injustices and what makes them systemic, and 3) how and to what degree students focus in on presenting potential solutions and/or responses.

- *Description of how the results were shared with faculty and how your department/program responded to the results, including any plans for future improvement or assessment of your program indicated by the results.*

I will email this report to the CDS Advisory Board members, and we will discuss the outcomes at our first spring advisory board meeting. One important point is that the reliability of this assessment of PLO2 is limited, due the fact that there is only 1 person assessing these work products. Such a process is certainly less than ideal, as there is no possibility for norming or control methods. I propose that this process can serve as a pilot model for assessing this PLO in the future, with a full assessment team, as we now have a collaboratively created rubric, and a stronger understanding of how well students are meeting this PLO than we had previously.

As I hope to be on sabbatical in 2023-2024, and am completing my 3rd year of a 3 year term as director this spring, I will propose that whoever is CDS director next year should consider assessing PLO2 again, using this coming spring 2024’s capstone projects, but

with a full assessment team of at 3 people. However, as there will only be ~4 majors doing a capstone this spring, that may not be ideal. Another option would be to move onto PLO3, which has never been assessed, and wait for another year, when there are more CDS majors in capstone, to re-assess PLO2.

We might also discuss whether we want capstone instructors to require student projects to address solutions/responses to systemic injustices. Yet, it must be weighed into consideration that a project focused on articulating systemic injustices can be very valuable without necessarily offering solutions/responses.

Lastly, I will work with our program assistant, Allison Gallardo, to begin archiving our assessment reports, feedback on reports, and rubrics, to make the process more manageable for the next director.

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

Given last year's feedback that we should determine work products and rubrics with which to assess PLO2 and PLO3, which had never been assessed, I made the determination to begin that process with this test pilot for PLO2. I felt that, while it is certainly imperfect with only myself assessing the work products, it would nonetheless be useful to directly engage student work and thereby establish a tangible foundation for future assessment. Further, last year's feedback reminded me of how important it is to have a strong rubric; thus, working with Nicole Gonzalez Howell, who is skilled in rubrics and assessment, in order to create a rubric for PLO2, is also a substantial outcome. Indeed, we can save this rubric to be used by future directors.