

CRITICAL DIVERSITY STUDIES

ASSESSMENT REPORT
ACADEMIC YEAR 2018 – 2019
REPORT DUE DATE: 11/01/2019

Some useful contacts:

1. Prof. Alexandra Amati, FDCD, Arts – adamati@usfca.edu
2. Prof. John Lendvay, FDCD, Sciences – lendvay@usfca.edu
3. Prof. Mark Meritt, FDCD, Humanities – meritt@usfca.edu
4. Prof. Michael Jonas, FDCD, Social Sciences – mrjonas@usfca.edu
5. Prof. Suparna Chakraborty, AD Academic Effectiveness – schakraborty2@usfca.edu

Academic Effectiveness Annual Assessment Resource Page:

<https://myusf.usfca.edu/arts-sciences/faculty-resources/academic-effectiveness/assessment>

Email to submit the report: assessment_cas@usfca.edu

Important: Please write the name of your program or department in the subject line.

For example: FineArts_Major (if you decide to submit a separate report for major and minor); FineArts_Aggregate (when submitting an aggregate report)

I. LOGISTICS

1. Please indicate the name and email of the program contact person to whom feedback should be sent (usually Chair, Program Director, or Faculty Assessment Coordinator).

Genevieve Leung, Program Director, Critical Diversity Studies

gleung2@usfca.edu

Submitted on behalf of the 2019 CDS Board: Christina Garcia Lopez (cgllopez3@usfca.edu), Ja'nina Garrett-Walker (jgarrettwalker@usfca.edu), and Sarah Burgess (sburgess@usfca.edu)

2. Please indicate if you are submitting report for (a) a Major, (b) a Minor, (c) an aggregate report for a Major & Minor (in which case, each should be explained in a separate paragraph as in this template), (d) a Graduate or (e) a Certificate Program

This report is being submitted for (a) a major.

3. Please note that a Curricular Map should accompany every assessment report. Has there been any revisions to the Curricular Map?

No.

II. MISSION STATEMENT & PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

1. Were any changes made to the program mission statement since the last assessment cycle in October 2018? Kindly state “Yes” or “No.”

No.

Please provide the current mission statement below. If you are submitting an aggregate report, please provide the current mission statements of both the major and the minor program

Mission Statement (Major/Graduate/Certificate):

Critical Diversity Studies (CDS) is a non-Departmental interdisciplinary major at the University of San Francisco (USF) that was formally established in 2014-15, and is housed in the College of Arts and Sciences’ Social Science Division. To complete the major, students take 20 units of required core courses in the major; then they take 20 units in a concentration of their choosing: Comparative Diversity Studies (CDS), African American Studies (AFAM), Asian Pacific American Studies (APAS), Chicanx/Latinx/Indigenous Studies (CLS), or Gender and Sexualities Studies (GSS). Curriculum and instruction for AFAM, APAS, CLS, and GSS courses are managed by the coordinators and boards of those affiliate minor programs.

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 [especially 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.”

This mission is exceptionally aligned with USF’s mission of offering “students the knowledge and skills needed to succeed as persons and professionals, and the values and sensitivity necessary to be men and women for others.”

2. Were any changes made to the program learning outcomes (PLOs) since the last assessment cycle in October 2017? Kindly state “Yes” or “No.”

No

3. Please provide the current PLOs below. If you are submitting an aggregate report, please provide the current PLOs for both the major and the minor programs.

Note: Major revisions in the program learning outcomes need to go through the College Curriculum Committee (contact: Professor Joshua Gamson, gamson@usfca.edu). Minor editorial changes are not required to go through the College Curriculum Committee.

CDS’ submitted Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) are:

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.
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).
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)

4. State the particular Program Learning Outcome(s) you assessed for the academic year 2018-2019.

In 2017, CDS assessed **PLO1** by collectively evaluating the essay response to the Spring 2017 final essay examination for its required introductory course, **CDS100/ HIST128** (Ideals of Citizenship). This was the first time CDS did any form of assessment.

In 2018, CDS assessed the same **PLO1** for its **CDS400 (capstone)** course. This was the largest CDS graduating class to date (N=13).

In 2019, CDS decided to assess **PLO1** yet again for the final essay exam its required introductory course, **CDS100/HIST128** (Ideals of Citizenship) to see how the introductory students fared. To evaluate final essay responses, the following rubric, which was also used in 2017 and 2018, was applied:

5.

CDS PLO1 Rubric				
Criteria	Performance Standards			
	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Meets Expectations (3)	Needs Improvement (2)	Below Expectations (1)
Identifies social, economic, and political forces shaping the historical experiences of historically marginalized and underrepresented US groups	Identifies social, economic, and political forces with exceptional specificity and accuracy.	Identifies social, economic, and political forces with acceptable specificity and accuracy.	Identifies some social, economic, and political forces with limited specificity or accuracy.	Did not identify social, economic, and political forces, or articulates content with excessive errors.
Explains how social, economic, and political forces have shaped historical experiences of historically marginalized and underrepresented US groups	Explains how social, economic, and political forces have shaped historical experiences of US ethnic and racial communities with exceptional clarity and accuracy.	Explains how social, economic, and political forces have shaped historical experiences of US ethnic and racial communities with acceptable clarity and accuracy.	Explains how some social, economic, and political forces have shaped historical experiences of US ethnic and racial communities with limited clarity or accuracy.	Did not how social, economic, and political forces have shaped historical experiences of US ethnic and racial communities, or articulates significance with excessive errors.
Compares the historical experiences of historically marginalized and underrepresented US groups	Compares the historical experiences of diverse US ethnic and racial communities with exceptional understanding and insight (e.g. depth of analysis, astuteness, originality).	Compares the historical experiences of diverse US ethnic and racial communities with acceptable understanding and insight.	Compares the historical experiences of diverse US ethnic and racial communities with limited understanding or insight.	Did not compare the historical experiences of diverse US ethnic and racial communities.

III. METHODOLOGY

Describe the methodology that you used to assess the PLO(s).

The members of the board numbered and divided the 25 papers for CDS100, which were blinded for identifying information such as name and ID numbers. One member evaluated the first six essays, another evaluated the last seven essays, another evaluated all odd-numbered essays, and the last evaluated all even-numbered essays. Without discussion, each rater used the rubric to evaluate each response (each response was reviewed by two members of the team). Initial scores for each PLO criteria were inputted for each essay. In this initial process, we achieved a .84 interrater reliability, which we found to be quite reliable considering we did not have robust discussions about the documents. We then discussed and resolved the rating differences by group consensus. A final score was arrived at by comparing individual reviewer scores and resolving any discrepancies to yield a single score. We will be able to use the current data set to create anchors and calibration materials for the next data collection.

Total number of Level 1s (“Below Expectations”), Level 2s (“Needs Improvement”), Level 3s (“Meets Expectations”), and Level 4s (“Exceed Expectations”) were tabulated for each PLO criteria. We then collapsed Levels 3 and 4 into (“Meets and/or Exceeds Expectations”), eliminating any further need to use four levels since we felt that “meets and/or exceeds” was an adequate label for assessment and no further separation was necessary.

IV. RESULTS & MAJOR FINDINGS

Below are the main findings of the assessment:

	Criterion 1 Identify	Criterion 2 Explain	Criterion 3 Compare
Level 1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Level 2	2 (8%)	3 (12%)	13 (52%)
Level 3	23 (92%)	22 (88%)	12 (48%)

Data show that students are able to demonstrate (meeting and exceeding expectations, combined as “Level 3”) identifying and explaining various social forces in their final essay responses, but need much more work with the comparative aspect in looking more deeply at the interactions across historically marginalized and underrepresented US groups. In fact, 12 students (48%) were able to meet or exceed expectations for this learning outcome. The other 52% needed more work in this criterion.

This actually mirrors 2017’s findings, where CDS students excelled at identifying the various forces shaping US history (PLO1 Criteria 1) but were least proficient in the comparison criteria (PLO1 Criteria 3). This demonstrates to us that consistently, at both the introductory and advanced coursework levels, additional support needs to be made in explicitly instructing our students to use a comparative lens, or that we need to adjust our LOs and/or rubric to best calibrate to the work our students are actually doing.

V. CLOSING THE LOOP

1. Based on your results, what changes/modifications are you planning in order to achieve the desired level of mastery in the assessed learning outcome? This section could also address more long-term planning that your department/program is considering and does not require that any changes need to be implemented in the next academic year itself.

Closing the Loop (Major/Graduate/Certificate):

To “close the loop” we will consider the following actions:

- Redesigning measurement tools more aptly suited for the task
- Changing pedagogical practices

From last year's assessment, we had mentioned we would:

- Advise course instructors to prepare clear assessment instruments (i.e., assignment, examination, and/ or essay prompts, survey questions, etc.), to ensure that students have sufficient opportunity to demonstrate how they are meeting PLOs in a course. Since our capstone instructor will be changing, we need to make sure there is continuity across courses.
- Revise PLO1 to better include Gender and Sexualities Studies. The current wording now uses “historically marginalized and underrepresented US groups” to encompass all of CDS’ concentrations.
- Add a new PLO (PLO4): “Compare the histories and experiences of multiple historically marginalized and underrepresented US groups, and appraise how these have influenced inter-group relationships.”

2. What were the most important suggestions/feedback from the FDCD on your last assessment report (for academic year 2016-2017, submitted in October 2017)? How did you incorporate or address the suggestion(s) in this report?

Suggestions (Major/Graduate/Certificate):

Last year we received positive feedback on our assessment report – thank you for the feedback. The one thing we do need to change (and the CDS Director will definitely get to this this academic year) is to add a PLO4 to Curriculog. Former CDS Director Evelyn Rodriguez and the current director attempted to do it once again but we got the document kicked back to us and did not have time to pick it back up again. We will make sure these edits are in place the next time we are assessed in 2020.

	PLO1	PLO2	PLO3
Institutional Learning Outcomes X Program Learning Outcomes	Comparatively analyze social, economic, and political forces shaping the historical and contemporary experiences of diverse U.S. ethnic and racial communities through academic and service learning contexts.	Be equipped with knowledge and skills necessary 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).	Critically connect coursework with other academic and co-curricular programs where diversity expertise is especially useful (especially those who are double majoring in CDS and another major like Sociology, Education, or Urban Studies)
Institutional Learning Outcomes			
1. Students reflect on and analyze their attitudes, beliefs, values, and assumptions about diverse communities and cultures and contribute to the common good.	M Student is fully able to connect lessons more means with at least one historical community in the US, D Student is moderately able to connect, I Student focuses mostly on one experience/self	M Student is able to successfully navigate relevant programs related to CDS, I Student is able to navigate with moderate success, D Student is only somewhat successful	M Student connects course content with other academic and co-curricular programs, I Student is moderately able to connect, D Student largely sticks to content on course at a time
2. Students explain and apply disciplinary concepts, practices, and ethics of their chosen academic discipline in diverse communities.	M Student is fully able to articulate concepts related to one academic discipline, D Student is moderately able to articulate, I Student can barely to articulate	M Student relates successfully across various professional settings, I Student moderately relates, D Student limited to one setting	M Student regularly connects material learned in one CDS course to other course material, I Student moderately connects, D Student seldom connects
3. Students construct, interpret, analyze, and evaluate information and ideas derived from a multitude of sources.	M Student is fully able to draw key references with ease to construct complete arguments, D Student is moderately able to draw, I Student can barely to draw	M Student fully draws a range of relevant primary sources to explore diverse topics related to CDS, I Student moderately draws diverse sources, D Student limits to certain sources in certain fields	M Student connects material from a variety of sources across coursework, I Student moderately connects, D Student sticks to certain types of sources and course material
4. Students communicate effectively in written and oral forms to interact within their personal and professional communities.	M Student actively participates in seminars and lectures as to present what is learned in class, D Student moderately participates in seminars and lectures, I Student does it to limited to just one activity/subject	M Student successfully presents orally and in written texts to community and generally state holders a host of thoughtful concerns, D Student moderately engages in relevant presentations, I Student barely to engage	M Student has considerable amount of presenting orally and in written format across courses, I Student has less considerable amount, D Student begins to develop presenting skills
5. Students use technology to access and communicate information in their personal and professional lives.	M Student fully utilizes technology through research to find knowledge products to address and complete assignments, D Student moderately uses technology, I Student barely begins to use technology	M Student fully grasps and deploys technology and engages in diverse professional/academic settings, I Student moderately engages, D Student begins to engage	M Student fully uses technology to moderately access course content, I Student moderately uses technology, D Student begins to use it in certain limitedly
6. Students use multiple methods of inquiry and research processes to answer questions and solve problems.	M Student fully engages with community and scholarly resources to find it complete social issues, D Student moderately engages, I Student barely begins to engage with no scholarly issues	M Student actively uses informational and relevant primary methods to explore complex social issues, D Student moderately uses informational and secondary methods, I Student is limited to certain methods	M Student fully deploys methodology from various courses to answer questions about complex social issues, I Student moderately develops some as methodology, D Student begins to use certain methods from certain courses
7. Students describe, analyze, and evaluate global interconnectedness in social, economic, environmental and political systems that shape diverse groups within the San Francisco Bay Area and the world.	M Student fully engages locally and globally in case studies via research issues, D Student moderately engages, I Student barely begins to engage	M Student fully interacts with local and relevant social issues, D Student moderately relates, I Student focuses mostly at local level	M Student fully interacts with the connections between local/global issues across coursework, D Student moderately engages local/global issues, I Student focuses mostly at local level and to certain courses

Key:
I = Introductory
D = Developing
M = Mastery