

Chicana/o Studies Latina/o Program Assessment
Date: 6/11/12

Framing Assessment

To supportively scaffold assessment efforts within department and across the programs, the Department Chair and the other Program Directors thought it would be helpful to assess Ethnic Studies majors and minors. In this first collective effort towards assessment within the Chicana/os Studies Program in conjunction with a Program Assessment, the Chair along with the Program Directors formally initiated an assessment for this Spring 2013 within Content Mastery; specifically section C, Concepts and Theories/Old and New in Ethnic Studies. Disaggregated the learning objectives within this section are as follows:

C. Concepts and Theories/Old and New in Ethnic Studies

1. understanding and ability to analyze the concept of "race" and the evolution of the human species
2. ability to subject concepts such as melting pot, culture of poverty, deprivation, and assorted socio-pathological models to rigid analysis
3. understanding and ability to apply new models and paradigms to the study of the ethnic group experience.

With the above learning outcome, the Chair and Program Directors initiated assessment efforts with a Critical Thinking Rubric (CTR). The items listed below generally speak to the criterion of the CTR. In terms of scoring, CTR offers a score of 1-4, 4 being the highest and 1 being the lowest. For more details, please refer to the attached table.

In the short term, the CTR allows us to have starting point to address faculty learning curves regarding the utilization of rubrics. In the long term, the knowledge base of rubrics given the lessons learned this first round would likely initiate the creation of a rubric that will more responsively speak to the nature and discipline of Ethnic Studies.

Summative Assessment & Critical Thinking Rubric

In an effort to contribute to the overall Program Assessment of the Ethic Studies major, a Classroom Assessment was conducted in Ethnic Studies (Ethn) 130, Chicano/Mexican American Experience. As confirmed in the course catalog, the course transmits knowledge and understanding of how racism confronts and divides American society. Attention will be given to the effects of racism on the experiences of Chicanos/Mexican Americans in American society. This course was elected because it meets the requirement for the Ethnic Studies major and is also a course requirement for the Chicana/o Studies minor.

Established contacting with the faculty assigned to teach Ethn 130, the written work of eight students who either majored in Ethnic Studies or had in Chicana/o Latina/o Studies Concentration were photocopied.

With the above CTR criterion, a summative assessment was conduct Spring 2013 by the course by posing the following prompt in the *midterm exam*: Please discuss the Theories of Prejudice (Exploitation, Scapegoating, Normative, and Authoritarian) we reviewed in class and give

examples that apply to the Chicano experience. Approximately 10 sentences.

Preserving student anonymity, an artifact analysis (essay question-midterm examination) of seven students will be scored according to the CTR criterion given the prompt identified in the midterm.

Table 1: Summative Assessment Scores

	<u>Explanation</u>	<u>Evidence</u>	<u>Influence</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Conclusion</u>	Total Score
<u>Student 1</u>	3	4	4	3	4	18
<u>Student 2</u>	4	3	3	3	2	15
<u>Student 3</u>	3	4	4	4	2	17
<u>Student 4</u>	4	4	4	4	4	20
<u>Student 5</u>	3	3	3	3	4	16
<u>Student 6</u>	2	3	3	3	2	13
<u>Student 7</u>	2	2	3	2	1	12
<u>Student 8*</u>	1	1	1	1	1	5

*Please note: Student 8 started but did not complete the answer for the question sufficient enough to score.

Summative Assessment: Scores and Comments

Each of the following tables identify each of the criteria for the CTR rubric, provide an overview of where a particular number of students scored for a particular criteria, and then below each of the five tables explains the score and its corresponding explanation. Finally, a brief discussion of analysis and future considerations is provided.

Table 2: Scored Criteria- Explanation of issues				
<i>Score</i>	4	3	2	1
<i># of Students</i>	2	3	2	1

Score Explanation:

4- Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding.

3- Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions

2- Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.

1- Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.

Overall Score Analysis for Table 2:

Students that scored a 4 did a great job either defining the concept or at couching their understanding of the concept in the examples. Students that scored either 3 or 2 are still developing their explanation of the issue. In terms of the student that scored 1, they

began the written discussion but never completed their thought.

Table 3: Scored Criteria- Evidence: Selecting and Using Information to investigate a point of view or conclusion				
<i>Score</i>	4	3	2	1
<i># of Students</i>	3	3	1	1

Score Explanation:

4- Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly.

3- Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning.

2- Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning.

1- Information is taken from source(s) without any. interpretation/evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question.

Overall Score Analysis for Table 3:

Three students that scored a 4 linked explanations to examples in a commanding manner. The four students that scored either a 3 or 2 are still developing a sense of how to relate their definitions to an example relevant to the class versus generally in society. In terms of the student that scored 1, they began the written discussion but never completed their thought.

Table 4: Scored Criteria- Influence of context and assumptions				
<i>Score</i>	4	3	2	1
<i># of Students</i>	3	4	0	1

Score Explanation:

4- Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.

3- Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.

1- Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position.

Overall Score Analysis of Table 4:

The three students that scored a 4 were able to account for assumptions and context within their discussion of evidence as it related to understanding each of the theories. The four students whose score was 3 are clearly moving in the right direction for understanding the role of assumptions and analysis. In terms of the student that scored 1, they began the written discussion

but never completed their thought.

Table 5: Scored Criteria- Student's position				
<i>Score</i>	4	3	2	1
<i># of Students</i>	2	4	1	1

Score Explanation:

4- Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).

3- Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).

2- Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.

1- Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.

Overall Score Analysis for Table 5:

The 2 students that scored a 4 were able to take more than one perspective on a situation relative to their own experiences. The four students that scored either a 3 or 2 are still developing a way to reflect their awareness of complex issues versus reporting. In terms of the student that scored 1, they began the written discussion but never completed their thought.

Table 6: Criterion-Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences)				
<i>Score</i>	4	3	2	1
<i># of Students</i>	3	0	3	2

Score Explanation:

4- Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order.

2- Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.

1- Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.

Overall Score Analysis for Table 6:

The three students that scored 4 were addressed all aspects of the prompt including relating it back to the Chicano experience. The students that scored 2 were developing a discussion towards addressing the prompt but did not quite speak to the last part of the prompt which was to address the Chicano experience.

Summary Analysis:

Thus far, the CTR scores of the summative assessment namely the midterm reveal the majority of students were on the side of mastery (4-Capstone) or developing mastery (3/2 Milestone). The main issue for the students identified with Milestone scores was having a sense of organization to cohesively discuss findings rather than report out their findings. As for the lowest scoring student, the issue of time seemed to be the main cause for the minimal development in the essay.

Next Steps- Suggested Recommendations:

As suggested by Angelo and Cross (1993), “when college teachers routinely gather potentially useful information on student learning through questions, quizzes, homework, and exams, it is often collected too late—at least from the students’ perspective—to affect learning (p.7)”.

As a program within the Ethnic Studies Department, we expect to continue scaffolding our understanding of assessment with each progressive round of assessment. Always prioritizing students' mastery of critical thinking, it seems that incorporating formative assessments would scaffold skill development. Formative assessments would not be scored but would be a clear way for faculty instructors to gain clarity of where students are in their critical thinking abilities. The suggested recommendations are listed only to outline possible next steps.

Suggested Recommendation#1: Rubric Development and Implementation

The creation, use, and implementation of rubrics. When students are given a Critical Thinking Rubric or whatever kind of rubric is deemed appropriate—depending on the assignment—students can explicitly access faculty expectations and quickly self-assess their learning curves.

Suggested Recommendation #2: 3 Formative and 1 Summative Assessment

Formative and Summative Assessment-We intend to utilize a combination of formative assessments such as the Misconception/Preconception Check, One Minute Paper, or the Muddiest Point. Each of these formative assessments were located in the Angelo and Cross (1993) book, titled, Classroom Assessment Techniques: A Handbook for College Teachers. The summative assessment can be linked back to the learning goal for the course. In the process of preparing students for the midterm, final exam, or final project, students receive instruction that includes a reminder of the learning goal for that particular assignment.