

<NAME OF YOUR PROGRAM/DEPARTMENT/MAJOR OR MINOR>

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

- **Who should submit the report? – All majors, minors (including interdisciplinary minors), graduate and non-degree granting certificate programs of the College of Arts and Sciences.**
- **Programs can combine assessment reports for a major and a minor program into one aggregate report as long as the mission statements, program learning outcome(s) evaluated, methodology applied to each, and the results are clearly delineated in separate sections**
- **Undergraduate, Graduate and Certificate Programs must submit separate reports**
- **It is recommended that assessment report not exceed 10 pages. Additional materials (optional) can be added as appendices**
- **Curriculum Map should be submitted along with Assessment Report**

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).

Program Director, Christina Garcia Lopez, cglopez3@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

(b) A minor

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

Yes. I adjusted the wording for PLO2 to match the slight revision we had made the previous year, and which was explained on last year's assessment report. Specifically, "texts that examine, interrogate, and consider" was shortened to "texts that analyze." Additionally, since the course formerly listed as SOC 313 has now switched numbers to SOC 218, I made that adjustment as well. The course itself is the same.

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." 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):

Mission Statement (Minor): No.

Chican@-Latin@ Studies prepares students for informed political action and justice work with and within Chican@ and Latin@ communities.

The program is based on the recognition of the country's growing Latin@ 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 Chican@ and Latin@ 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.

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

PLOs (Major/Graduate/Certificate):

PLOs (Minor):

1. Comparatively analyze social, economic, and/or political forces shaping the historical experiences of Chicanx and Latinx communities through academic contexts.
2. Students can read and write academically and intellectually sophisticated texts that analyze issues relating to Chicanx and Latinx communities.
3. 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.
4. Students can summarize and critically assess current social, political, and economic issues that affect Chicanx and Latinx Studies.

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

PLO(s) being assessed (Major/Graduate/Certificate):

PLO(s) being assessed (Minor):

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

III.METHODOLOGY

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

For example, “the department used questions that were inputted in the final examination pertaining directly to the <said PLO>. An independent group of faculty (not teaching the course) then evaluated the responses to the questions and gave the students a grade for responses to those questions.”

Important Note – WSCUC advises us to use “direct methods” which relate to a direct evaluation of a student work product. “Indirect methods” like exit interviews or student surveys can be used only as additional | complements to a direct method.

For any program with fewer than 10 students: If you currently have fewer than 10 students in your program (rendering your statistical analysis biased due to too few data points), it is fine to describe a multi-year data collection strategy here. It would be important to remember that every 3 years, we would expect you to have enough data to conduct a meaningful analysis.

Important: *Please attach, at the end of this report, a copy of the rubric used for assessment.*

Methodology used (Major/Graduate/Certificate):

Methodology used (Minor):

Our assessment committee, consisting of Nicole Gonzalez-Howell, Roberto Varea, and Christina Garcia Lopez, assessed a midterm essay from Julio Moreno's S19 course, HIST 379 Latinos in the U.S. We broke PLO 1 into 3 criteria (see rubric), at a rate of 3=exceeds, 2=meets, and 1=does not meet. Out of a total 20 students enrolled, we were given a sample of 13 students' essays. Our norming process consisted of scoring the first essay individually and then discussing it collectively. Thereafter, we split up the remaining samples, with Nicole scoring the first 6, Christina scoring the last 6, and Roberto scoring even numbered samples. This ensured that each paper was scored at least once, with some being scored twice. We then compiled and compared the scores, and discussed their significance and implications.

IV. RESULTS & MAJOR FINDINGS

What are the major takeaways from your assessment exercise?

This section is for you to highlight the results of the exercise. Pertinent information here would include:

- a. how well students mastered the outcome at the level they were intended to,
- b. any trends noticed over the past few assessment cycles, and
- c. the levels at which students mastered the outcome based on the rubric used.

To address this, among many other options, one option is to use a table showing the distribution, for example:

Level	Percentage of Students
Complete Mastery of the outcome	8.7%
Mastered the outcome in most parts	20.3%
Mastered some parts of the outcome	66%
Did not master the outcome at the level intended	5%

Results (Major/Graduate/Certificate):

Results (Minor):

According to the rubric, a perfect score for any individual essay would be a 9 (a score of 3 in each of the 3 criteria areas). 9 would signify that the student exceeded expectations in all 3 areas, whereas a score of 6 would signify that the student, either met expectations in all 3 areas, or exceeded expectations in 2 of the 3 areas. Finally, a score of 3 would signify that the student did not meet expectations. **Overall, the average score was a 7.78 (out of a possible 9), signifying that, on average, students fell between meeting and exceeding expectations.** More specifically, every student scored at least a 6 or higher, and no student scored a 1 (“does not meet expectations”) in any individual area; thus, we conclude that since **every student in the sample scored at least a 2 (“meets expectations”) in each criteria area**, students are meeting or exceeding PLO1. Further, 4 of 13 students scored a 9 (“exceeds expectation”), signifying that **almost 1/3 of students are exceeding expectations for this PLO.** Ultimately, we determined that PLO1 was very measurable, and upheld the outcomes we are seeking for the program.

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):

Closing the Loop (Minor):

The sample and course strongly demonstrated the desired outcomes. Thus, we discussed the possibility that HIST 379 Latinos in the U.S. might be useful as a required/foundational course for the program. We were also generally happy with the PLO; if anything, we could consider altering the phrase “Chicanx and Latinx communities” to “Chicanx~Latinx communities” to signify that these are not 2 separate but rather interrelated communities.

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):

Suggestions (Minor): Last year’s feedback thanked us for involving multiple faculty in the assessment process, which we continued on this year, making sure to have 3 faculty members on the assessment team. Also, the affirmation that our PLOs are clear and measurable was quite helpful!

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

(Any rubrics used for assessment, relevant tables, charts and figures should be included here)

CLS PLO1 Criteria	3=Exceeds	2=Meets	1=Does Not Meet
Comparative analysis of forces (social, economic, and/or political)	Student provides methodic, detailed examination, across more than 1 type of force, leading to a clear explanation or interpretation.	Student provides somewhat detailed examination, across more than 1 type of force, leading to a generally clear explanation or interpretation.	Student either does not provide sufficient detail or method in their examination to lead to a clear explanation or interpretation, or they fail to do so across more than 1 type of force.
Use of academic contexts	Student yields their analysis through substantial citation of, or knowledgeable reference to, scholarly work, i.e. theories, studies, analyses, critiques.	Student yields their analysis through moderate but meaningful citation of, or generally knowledgeable reference to, scholarly work, i.e. theories, studies, analyses, critiques.	Student's analysis is not yielded through scholarly work, i.e. theories, studies, analyses, critiques, in that they neither cite or reference such work, or they do not do so with any clear connection to the analysis they offer.
Relevance to Chicax/Latinx communities	Student clearly explains how the forces analyzed contributed to shaping the historical experiences of Chicax and Latinx communities.	Student analyzes forces directly relevant to shaping the historical experiences of Chicax and Latinx communities, though the direct process of shaping is not completely explained.	Student's analysis of forces is not directly relevant to shaping the historical experiences of Chicax and Latinx communities.