

**Assurance of Student Learning
2019-2020**

Potter College of Arts & Letters

Department of Sociology & Criminology

Diversity & Community Studies 631

Use this page to list learning outcomes, measurements, and summarize results for your program. Detailed information must be completed in the subsequent pages.

Student Learning Outcome 1: [Apply a critical interdisciplinary framework for understanding social and structural forms of oppression at local and global scales](#)

Instrument 1 **Direct: Analysis of Capstone Projects/Research Paper**

Based on your results, [mark] your conclusion regarding the program's goal of meeting Student Learning Outcome 1.

Met

Not Met

Student Learning Outcome 2: [Collect data using interdisciplinary, community-based research methods](#)

Instrument 1 **Direct: Analysis of Capstone Projects/Research Paper**

Based on your results, [mark] your conclusion regarding the program's goal of meeting Student Learning Outcome 2.

Met

Not Met

Student Learning Outcome 3: [Analyze strategies to confront social inequities \(racism, sexism, and heterosexism\)](#)

Instrument 1 **Direct: Analysis of Capstone Projects/Research Paper**

Based on your results, [mark] your conclusion regarding the program's goal of meeting Student Learning Outcome 3.

Met

Not Met

Student Learning Outcome 4: [Synthesize social and historical contexts of diversity in the U.S. through multiple perspectives](#)

Instrument 1 **Direct: Analysis of Capstone Projects/Research Paper**

Based on your results, [mark] your conclusion regarding the program's goal of meeting Student Learning Outcome 3.

Met

Not Met

Program Summary (Briefly summarize the action and follow up items from your detailed responses on subsequent pages.)

Overall, the results from this assessment indicate that the mean scores for all SLOs are far below targets set. In 2017/18, the program was just beginning to see its first graduates and to collect artifacts from the capstone course for assessment. The following recommendations came out of this year's assessment:

- Examination of program learning outcomes for the core course and program outcomes:
 - Are we teaching what we say we are going to teach?
 - Are the learning outcomes measurable?
 - Are the learning outcomes formulated well?
- Establish more comprehensive assignments guidelines to measure learning from the capstone project/research paper:
 - Establish a uniform assignment for each outcome, or one assignment that measures all.
 - Assessment of changes to program components and core courses.
- Program changes:
 - Explore the option of changing the capstone course to an internship/practicum.
 - Reexamine the SLO of other core course and determine which program outcomes would be best measured in each course. In retrospect, the capstone course final paper did not meet the criteria of the rubric or properly measure program outcomes.
- Reconstruct the correlation matrix to ensure students are given the opportunity to achieve program SLO through core course work:
 - Review program mission and outcomes.
 - Review outcomes for core courses.
 - Ensure program outcomes are met through core courses.

Student Learning Outcome 1

Student Learning Outcome 1	Apply a critical interdisciplinary framework for understanding social and structural forms of oppression at local and global scales		
Measurement Instrument 1	DIRECT measures of student learning: Students in the capstone course were given a final, written project/research paper that required them to synthesize their work in the program's core courses. The paper was designed to be broken into four parts to evaluate each program SLO separately. To assess SLO 1, students were asked to synthesize four articles from <i>Readings in Social Justice</i> and apply them to their career goals. Students were evaluated on the ability to link theory and/or concepts to practice.		
Criteria for Student Success	Students should at the end of the program score between upper "milestone" and lower "capstone" on the LEAP Critical Thinking Rubric (somewhere between 85-90%). Scores on the rubric item for this SLO ranged from score of 0 – 4: 0 = artifact did not address the rubric, 1 = Benchmark, 2 =Lower Milestone, 3 = Upper Milestone, and 4 = Capstone. On a 100% scale, the scores would reflect the following: "Capstone (90-100)," Milestones (Upper 80-89)/(Lower 70-79)," and Benchmark (69 or Below). <u>Zero, in any case, was reserved for artifacts not meeting the criteria of the rubric.</u>		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	85-90% (score = 3-4)	Percent of Program Achieving Target	15% of the artifacts met the program target <u>Scores are as follows:</u> 0% (score = 4) 15% (score = 3) 10% (score = 2) 25% (score = 1) 50% (score =0)
Methods	Direct: Artifacts from the capstone course project/paper were collected from all students in the course ($N = 10$) and all identifiers removed (student name, course numbers, faculty name). The papers were split among three full-time faculty so that each paper was read three times by different reviewers. In the event there was a difference in score greater than $1 \pm sd$, another faculty member was asked to review - the mean of all reviews was used as the final score. The rubric used for scoring was the LEAP Value Rubric for Critical Thinking; for this SLO, rubric items "Explanations of Issues" and "Evidence" were used.		
Based on the results above, [mark] your conclusion regarding the program's goal of meeting Student Learning Outcome 1.		Met	Not Met
Actions (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)			
Core course and program outcomes were examined in relation to each of the program learning outcomes. Questions driving the change included a) Are we teaching what we say we are teaching? b) Are the learning outcomes measurable? and c) Are the learning outcomes of core courses appropriately designed to address program outcomes? For the 2018-19, the department also established more explicit guidelines for the capstone project/research papers. It was determined that the assignment guidelines did not reflect the program outcomes (it did not measure what it need to measure); hence, 50% scored zero. Since it was predetermined the capstone project/paper would be used for assessment, it was recommended the assignment guidelines be adjusted to directly measure the program outcomes for the 2018/19 OR the course(s) used for assessment be changed.			
Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)			
Based on results from previous assessment, it was apparent that core course SLOs needed to reevaluated and the capstone assignment adjusted to accurately address this SLO or the program outcomes. Going forward, a matrix will be developed to evaluate the alignment between course and program SLOs each year. And finally, a lot of inconsistent rubric ratings were due to a lack of shared understanding of items. Taking more time to establish rating norms is imperative and decreasing error in ranking student scores. The biggest problem is the assessment does not address the SLOs/PLOs - the artifact and course used for assessment of the program will be changed next cycle.			

Student Learning Outcome 2

Student Learning Outcome 2	Collect data using interdisciplinary, community-based research methods		
Measurement Instrument 1	DIRECT measures of student learning: Students in the capstone course were given a final, written project/research paper that required them to synthesize their work in the program’s core courses. The paper was designed to be broken into four parts to evaluate each program SLO. To assess SLO 2, students were asked to synthesize four articles from <i>Readings in Social Justice</i> and apply them to their career goals. Students were evaluated on the ability to link theory and/or concepts to practice.		
Criteria for Student Success	Students should at the end of the program score between upper “milestone” and lower “capstone” on the LEAP Critical Thinking Rubric (somewhere between 85-90%). Scores on the rubric item for this SLO ranged from score of 0 – 4 on the rubric; 0 = artifact did not address the rubric, 1 = Benchmark, 2 =Lower Milestone, 3 = Upper Milestone, 4 = and Capstone. On a 100% scale, the scores would reflect the following: “Capstone (90-100),” Milestones (Upper 80-89)/(Lower 70-79),” and Benchmark (69 or Below). <u>Zero, in any case, was reserved for artifacts not meeting the criteria of the rubric.</u>		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	85-90% (score = 3-4)	Percent of Program Achieving Target	No artifacts met the program target <u>Scores are as follows:</u> 0% = (score = 4) 0% (score = 3) 0% (score = 2) 0% (score =1) 100% (score = 0)
Methods	Direct: Artifacts from the capstone course project/paper were collected from all students in the course ($N = 10$) and all identifiers removed (student name, course numbers, faculty name). The papers were split among three full-time faculty so that each paper was read three times by different reviewers. In the event there was a difference in score greater than $1 \pm sd$, another faculty member was asked to review - the mean of all reviews was used as the final score. The rubric used for scoring was the LEAP Value Rubric for Critical Thinking; for this SLO, rubric items “ <i>Influence of context and assumption</i> ” was used.		
Based on the results above, circle your conclusion regarding the program’s goal of meeting Student Learning Outcome 2.		Met	Not Met
Actions (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)			
Core course and program outcomes were examined in relation to each of the program learning outcomes. Questions driving the change included a) Are we teaching what we say we are teaching? b) Are the learning outcomes measurable? and c) Are the learning outcomes of core courses appropriately designed to address program outcomes? For the 2018-19, the department also established more explicit guidelines for the capstone project/research papers. It was determined that the assignment guidelines did not reflect the program outcomes (it did not measure what it need to measure). As a matter of fact, the assignment instructions did not inquire about data or community-based research at all; hence, 100% scored zero. The assignment will be will be adjusted to add this section to the paper. Since it was predetermined the capstone project/paper would be used for assessment, it was recommended the assignment guidelines be adjusted to directly measure the program outcomes for the 2018/19 <u>OR</u> the course(s) used for assessment be changed.			
Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)			
Based on results from previous assessment, it was apparent that core course SLOs needed to reevaluated and the capstone assignment adjusted to accurately address the program outcomes. Going forward, a matrix will be developed to evaluate the alignment between course and program SLOs each year. The biggest problem is the assessment does not address the SLOs/PLOs - the artifact and course used for assessment of the program will be changed next cycle. And finally, a lot of inconsistent rubric ratings were due to a lack			

of shared understanding of items. Taking more time to establish rating norms is imperative and decreasing error in ranking student scores. The biggest problem is the assessment does not address the SLOs/PLOs - the artifact and course used for assessment of the program will be changed next cycle.

Student Learning Outcome 3

Student Learning Outcome	Analyze strategies to confront social inequities (racism, sexism, and heterosexism)		
Measurement Instrument 1	DIRECT measures of student learning: Students in the capstone course were given a final, written project/research paper that required them to synthesize their work in the program's core courses. The paper was designed to be broken into four parts to evaluate each program SLO. To assess SLO 3, students were asked to synthesize four articles from <i>Readings in Social Justice</i> and apply them to their career goals. Students were evaluated on the ability to link theory and/or concepts to practice.		
Criteria for Student Success	Students should at the end of the program score between upper "milestone" and lower "capstone" on the LEAP Critical Thinking Rubric (somewhere between 85-90%). Scores on the rubric item for this SLO ranged from score of 0 – 4 on the rubric; 0 = artifact did not address the rubric, 1 = Benchmark, 2 =Lower Milestone, 3 = Upper Milestone, 4 = and Capstone. On a 100% scale, the scores would reflect the following: "Capstone (90-100)," Milestones (Upper 80-89)/(Lower 70-79)," and Benchmark (69 or Below). <u>Zero, in any case, was reserved for artifacts not meeting the criteria of the rubric.</u>		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	85-90% (score = 3-4)	Percent of Program Achieving Target	10% of the artifacts met program target Score are as follows: 0% (score = 4) 10% (score = 3) 0% (score = 2) 25% (score =1) 65% (score =0)
Methods	Direct: Artifacts from the capstone course project/paper were collected from all students in the course ($N = 10$) and all identifiers removed (student name, course numbers, faculty name). The papers were split among three full-time faculty so that each paper was read three times by different reviewers. In the event there was a difference in score greater than $1 \pm sd$, another faculty member was asked to review - the mean of all reviews was used as the final score. The rubric used for scoring was the LEAP Value Rubric for Critical Thinking; for this SLO, rubric items " <i>Student's position</i> " was used.		
Based on the results above, circle your conclusion regarding the program's goal of meeting Student Learning Outcome 3.		Met	Not Met
Actions (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)			
Core course and program outcomes were examined in relation to each of the program learning outcomes. Questions driving the change included a) Are we teaching what we say we are teaching? b) Are the learning outcomes measurable? and c) Are the learning outcomes of core courses appropriately designed to address program outcomes? For the 2018-19, the department also established more explicit guidelines for the capstone project/research papers. It was determined that the assignment guidelines did not reflect the program outcomes (it did not measure what it need to measure); hence, 65% scored zero. Since it was predetermined the capstone project/paper would be used for assessment, it was recommended the assignment guidelines be adjusted to directly measure the program outcomes for the 2018/19 OR the course(s) used for assessment be changed.			
Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)			
Based on results from previous assessment, it was apparent that core course SLOs needed to reevaluated and the capstone assignment adjusted to accurately address this SLO or the program outcomes. Going forward, a matrix will be developed to evaluate the alignment between course and program SLOs each year. And finally, a lot of inconsistent rubric			

ratings were due to a lack of shared understanding of items. Taking more time to establish rating norms is imperative and decreasing error in ranking student scores. The biggest problem is the assessment does not address the SLOs/PLOs - the artifact and course used for assessment of the program will be changed next cycle.

Student Learning Outcome 4

Student Learning Outcome	Synthesize social and historical contexts of diversity in the U.S. through multiple perspectives		
Measurement Instrument 1	DIRECT measures of student learning: Students in the capstone course were given a final, written project/research paper that required them to synthesize their work in the program's core courses. The paper was designed to be broken into four parts to evaluate each program SLO. To assess SLO 4, students were asked to synthesize four articles from <i>Readings in Social Justice</i> and apply them to their career goals. Students were evaluated on the ability to link theory and/or concepts to practice.		
Criteria for Student Success	Students should at the end of the program score between upper "milestone" and lower "capstone" on the LEAP Critical Thinking Rubric (somewhere between 85-90%). Scores on the rubric item for this SLO ranged from score of 0 – 4 on the rubric; 0 = artifact did not address the rubric, 1 = Benchmark, 2 =Lower Milestone, 3 = Upper Milestone, 4 = and Capstone. On a 100% scale, the scores would reflect the following: "Capstone (90-100)," Milestones (Upper 80-89)/(Lower 70-79)," and Benchmark (69 or Below). Zero, in any case, was reserved for artifacts not meeting the criteria of the rubric.		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	85-90% (score = 3-4)	Percent of Program Achieving Target	No artifacts met the program target Scores are as follows: 0% (score = 4) 0% (score = 3) 5% (score = 2) 30% (score = 1) 65% (score = 0)
Methods	Direct: Artifacts from the capstone course project/paper were collected from all students in the course ($N = 10$) and all identifiers removed (student name, course numbers, faculty name). The papers were split among three full-time faculty so that each paper was read three times by different reviewers. In the event there was a difference in score greater than $1 \pm sd$, another faculty member was asked to review - the mean of all reviews was used as the final score. The rubric used for scoring was the LEAP Value Rubric for Critical Thinking; for this SLO, rubric items " <i>Conclusions and related outcomes</i> " was used.		
Based on the results above, circle your conclusion regarding the program's goal of meeting Student Learning Outcome 3.		Met	Not Met
Actions (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)			
Core course and program outcomes were examined in relation to each of the program learning outcomes. Questions driving the change included a) Are we teaching what we say we are teaching? b) Are the learning outcomes measurable? and c) Are the learning outcomes of core courses appropriately designed to address program outcomes? For the 2018-19, the department also established more explicit guidelines for the capstone project/research papers. It was determined that the assignment guidelines did not reflect the program outcomes (it did not measure what it need to measure); hence, 65% scored zero. Since it was predetermined the capstone project/paper would be used for assessment, it was recommended the assignment guidelines be adjusted to directly measure the program outcomes for the 2018/19 <u>OR</u> the course(s) used for assessment be changed.			
Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)			
Based on results from previous assessment, it was apparent that core course SLOs needed to reevaluated and the capstone assignment adjusted to accurately address this SLO or the program outcomes. Going forward, a matrix will be developed to evaluate the alignment between course and program SLOs each year. And finally, a lot of inconsistent rubric			

ratings were due to a lack of shared understanding of items. Taking more time to establish rating norms is imperative and decreasing error in ranking student scores. The biggest problem is the assessment does not address the SLOs/PLOs - the artifact and course used for assessment of the program will be changed next cycle.