

ASSESSMENT REPORT

CRITICAL DIVERSITY STUDIES

ACADEMIC YEAR 2017 – 2018

I. LOGISTICS & PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

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 2018 CDS Board: Christina Garcia Lopez (cglopez3@usfca.edu), Ronald Sundstrom (rrsundstrom@usfca.edu), and Tamara Kneese (tkneese@usfca.edu)

2. Were any changes made to the program mission statement since the last assessment cycle in October 2017? 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.

No.

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.”

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.

No.

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)

Note: We had tried to revise the PLOs from last year but in transitioning from directors (Dr. Evelyn Rodriguez to Genevieve Leung) we were unable to get the Curriculog proposal approved in time. As such, the 2017-2018 PLOs still are in place.

4. Which particular Program Learning Outcome(s) did you assess for the academic year 2017-2018?

In 2017, CDS assessed **PLO1** by collectively evaluating the essay response to the **Spring 2017 Final Examination for its required introductory course, CDS 100/ HIST 128: "Ideals of Citizenship"**. This was the first time CDS did any form of assessment.

For 2018, CDS assessed the same PLO1 for its CDS400 (capstone) course. This was the largest CDS graduating class to date (N=13). To evaluate final essay responses, the following rubric, which was also used in 2017, was applied:

| 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 US history | 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 US ethnic and racial communities | 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 diverse US ethnic and racial communities | 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. |
|---|---|--|--|---|

II. METHODOLOGY

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

The members of the board numbered and divided the 13 papers for CDS 400, 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. 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 and a final score was arrived at by comparing individual reviewer scores and resolving any discrepancies to yield a single score.

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. Since this course only had CDS majors, unlike the 2017 assessment, there was no non-major comparison group.

III. RESULTS & MAJOR FINDINGS

6. What are the major takeaways from your assessment exercise?

Below are the main findings of the assessment:

| | Criterion 1 Identify | Criterion 2 Explain | Criterion 3 Compare |
|---------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Level 1 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (30.8%) |
| Level 2 | 0 (0%) | 0 (0%) | 7 (53.8%) |
| Level 3 | 8 (61.5%) | 10 (76.9%) | 1 (7.7%) |
| Level 4 | 5 (38.5%) | 3 (23.1%) | 1 (7.7%) |

Data show that students are able to demonstrate (meeting and exceeding expectations, Levels 3 and 4) identifying and explaining various social forces in their capstone papers, but need much more work with the comparative aspect in looking more deeply at the interactions across ethnic and racial communities. In fact, only two students

(15%) were able to meet or exceed expectations for this learning outcome. The vast majority (85%) needed more work in this criterion.

This actually mirrors last year'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 either more work needs to be done 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.

IV. CLOSING THE LOOP

- 7. 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.**

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

- Revising PLOs
- Modifying rubric
- Redesigning measurement tools more aptly suited for the task
- Changing pedagogical practices

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

- Revise PLO1 to: “Identify social, economic, or political forces shaping the historical experiences of historically marginalized and underrepresented US groups, and illustrate how such forces have influenced these communities' contemporary experiences.” Such a revision will enable our PLO1 to also be applied to our Gender and Sexualities concentration.
- 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.”
- Revise the PLO1 rubric accordingly, and create a new rubric to assess PLO4.
- 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.
- Instruct course instructors to identify which anonymous student materials were produced by both CDS majors and students in CDS' affiliated minor programs. Although this is not required by the University Assessment team, it would be helpful for CDS program instructors to see this data, especially to compare our CDS majors with our minors.
- Advise course instructors to emphasize to CDS majors that they must explicate how social, economic, and political forces have shaped US ethnic and racial communities—and should not presume this is common knowledge on assignments or examinations.

We will continue to work on the above points moving forward.

- 8. 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?**

We took all feedback into consideration as we assessed this year. As mentioned earlier, we attempted to change the PLOs in Curriculog to reflect some of the suggestions but did not make it in time with the change of directorship. We will make sure these edits are in place the next time we are assessed in 2019.