

ETHNIC STUDIES DEPARTMENT: 2013-2014 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Part 1: Background Information

B1. Program name: [Ethnic Studies]

B2. Report author(s): [Boatamo Mosupyoe]

B3. Fall 2012 enrollment: [136]

Use the *Department Fact Book 2013* by OIR (Office of Institutional Research) to get the fall 2012 enrollment:

(<http://www.csus.edu/oir/Data%20Center/Department%20Fact%20Book/Departmental%20Fact%20Book.html>).

B4. Program type: [SELECT ONLY ONE]

X	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
	2. Credential
	3. Master's degree
	4. Doctorate: Ph.D./E.D.D.
	5. Other, specify:

Part 2: Six Questions for the 2013-2014 Annual Assessment

Question 1 (Q1): Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) Assessed in 2013-2014.

Q1.1. Which of the following program learning outcomes (PLOs) or Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals did you assess in 2013-2014? (See 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report Guidelines for more details). **[CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]**

X	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1)*
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement - local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2013-2014 but not included above: a. b. c.

* One of the WASC's new requirements is that colleges and universities report on the level of student performance at graduation in five core areas: **critical thinking, information literacy, written communication, oral communication, and quantitative literacy.**

Q1.1.1. Please provide more detailed information about the PLO(s) you checked above:

As per the advice of Dr. Amy Liu, Director of University Assessment, the Department assessed 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. 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. and ability to apply new models and paradigms to the study of the ethnic group experience.

With the above learning outcome, we initiated assessment efforts with a Critical Thinking Rubric (CTR). This assessment is based on an assignment completed by students in ETHN 195B, Seminar in Ethnic Studies, a required course taken by students in all concentrations within the Ethnic Studies major. The assignments in the course include critical analysis demonstrated through writing 8 reflection papers, critical discourse and discussions as well as presentations. Each student also prepares a portfolio that includes assignments related to Critical Thinking from four CORE courses that they have taken through their degree path. The assessment also included assignments in portfolios prepared by the students in this class Ethnic 195B from four CORE courses in Ethnic Studies.

Q1.2. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q1.3. Is your program externally accredited (except for WASC)?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q1.4)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q1.4)

Q1.3.1. If yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q1.4. Have you used the *Degree Qualification Profile (DQP)** to develop your PLO(s)?

X	1. Yes
	2. No, but I know what DQP is.
	3. No. I don't know what DQP is.
	4. Don't know

* **Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP)** – a framework funded by the Lumina Foundation that describes the kinds of learning and levels of performance that may be expected of students who have earned an associate, baccalaureate, or master's degree. Please see the links for more details:

http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The_Degree_Qualifications_Profile.pdf and <http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org/DQPNew.html>.

Question 2 (Q2): Standards of Performance/Expectations for EACH PLO.

Q2.1. Has the program developed/adopted **EXPLICIT** standards of performance/expectations for the PLO(s) you assessed **in 2013-2014 Academic Year?** (For example: We expect 70% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 on the Written Communication VALUE rubric.)

X	1. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for ALL PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
	2. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for SOME PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
	3. No (If no, go to Q2.2)
	4. Don't know (Go to Q2.2)
	5. Not Applicable (Go to Q2.2)

Q2.1.1. If yes, what are the desired levels of learning, including the criteria and standards of performance/expectations, especially at or near graduation, for **EACH PLO** assessed in 2013-2014 Academic Year? (For example: what will tell you if students have achieved your expected level of performance for the learning outcome.) **Please provide the rubric and/or the expectations that you have developed for EACH PLO one at a time below.** [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

The desired levels of learning are: 1) content mastery, ability to summarize and critically evaluate the meaning of racial bias, 2) analyze the differences between objectivity and subjectivity and how they inform racial bias, and 3) the ability to critically reflect on their own biases, assess their own learning and engage in cognitive self- appraisal.

Criteria: Value Rubric was used to assess performance.

Standards of Performance Expectations: Given that the majors take Ethnic 195B towards the end of their graduation path, the expectation was for students not to score less than 2 in these categories: Explanation, Evidence, Influence, Position and Conclusion. In answering this question "Critically evaluate Rita Cameron-Wedding's article, *Defending Whiteness, Protecting White Privilege in Post-Civil Rights Society*, and discuss how the concept of color-blindness function to promote modern sanitized racism. In your discussion also compare your understanding of color-blindness with that of the author," we expected students to demonstrate the ability to analyze the concept of race and ability to apply new models and paradigms to the study of the ethnic group experience.

Indicators of successful level of achievement are determined by the score of 3 and 4. These levels indicate that students not only critically considered the issues/concept but they stated it well and their understanding is not ambiguous. The levels also indicate that their inferences and analysis are deeply rooted in the source of information and allows students to develop a comprehensive analysis. The ability to analyze own and others' assumptions thoroughly, systematically and methodically is also an indicator of success. The conclusions must be related to outcomes and the ability to place evidence and perspective in priority order will be additional indicators of success. (Rubric Attached).

Q2.2. Have you published the **PLO(s)/expectations/rubric(s)** you assessed in 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q3.1)

Q2.2.1. If yes, where were the **PLOs/expectations/rubrics** published? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

X	1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce/develop/master the PLO(s)
	2. In ALL course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce /develop/master the PLO(s)
	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
	4. In the university catalogue
	5. On the academic unit website or in the newsletters
	6. In the assessment or program review reports/plans/resources/activities
	7. In the new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
	10. In other places, specify:

Question 3 (Q3): Data, Results, and Conclusions for EACH PLO

Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence collected for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don't know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

Q3.2. If yes, was the data scored/evaluated for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don't know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

Q3.3. If yes, what **DATA** have you collected? What are the **results, findings, and CONCLUSION(s)** for EACH PLO assessed in 2013-2014? In what areas are students doing well and achieving the expectations? In what areas do students need improvement? Please provide a simple and clear summary of the key data and findings, including **tables and**

graphs if applicable for EACH PLO one at a time. [WORD LIMIT: 600 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

Preserving student anonymity, an artifact analysis of 5 papers were scored according to the CTR criterion given the prompt identified in reflection question and 5 papers taken from the portfolios. The first 5 papers come from reflection and the last five from portfolios.

Table 1: Summative Assessment Scores

	<u>Explan</u> <u>nation</u>	<u>Evid</u> <u>enc</u> <u>e</u>	<u>Influ</u> <u>ence</u>	<u>Pos</u> <u>itio</u> <u>n</u>	<u>Concl</u> <u>usion</u>	T o t a l S c o r e
<u>Stu</u> <u>de</u> <u>nt</u> <u>1</u>	3	4	4	3	4	1 8
<u>Stu</u> <u>de</u> <u>nt</u> <u>2</u>	4	3	3	3	2	1 5
<u>Stu</u> <u>de</u> <u>nt</u> <u>3</u>	3	4	4	4	2	1 7
<u>Stu</u> <u>de</u> <u>nt</u> <u>4</u>	4	4	4	4	4	2 0
<u>Stu</u> <u>de</u> <u>nt</u> <u>5</u>	3	3	3	3	4	1 6
<u>Stu</u> <u>de</u> <u>nt</u> <u>6</u>	3	3	3	3	2	1 4

<u>Stu</u> <u>de</u> <u>nt</u> <u>7</u>	3	2	3	2	2	1 2
<u>Stu</u> <u>de</u> <u>nt</u> <u>8</u>	4	3	3	3	2	1 5
<u>Stu</u> <u>de</u> <u>nt</u> <u>9</u>	4	4	4	4	4	2 0
<u>Stu</u> <u>de</u> <u>nt</u> <u>10</u>	3	3	3	3	4	1 6

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.

Table 2: Scored Criteria- Explanation of issues				
Score	4	3	2	1
# of Students	4	6	0	0

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 are still developing their explanation of the issue. None of the students scored 2 or 1, which means, all students completed their thoughts.

Score	4	3	2	1
# of Students	4	5	1	0

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.

Score	4	3	2	1
# of Students	4	6	0	0

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 four 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 six students whose score was 3 are clearly moving in the right direction for understanding the role of assumptions and analysis.

Table 5: Scored Criteria- Student's position				
Score	4	3	2	1
# of Students	3	6	1	0

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 3 students that scored a 4 were able to take more than one perspective on a situation relative to their own experiences. The six students that scored either a 3 or 2 are still developing a way to reflect their awareness of complex issues versus reporting.

Table 6: Criterion-Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences)				
Score	4	3	2	1
# of Students	5	0	5	0

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:

Students that scored 4 were addressed all aspects of the prompt including comparing their understanding of color-blindness with that of the author. The students the scored 2 were developing a discussion towards addressing the prompt but did not sufficiently quite speak to the last part of the prompt that required comparison.

Summary Analysis:

Thus far, the CTR scores of the summative assessments both reflection papers and papers from the CORE courses 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.

Q3.4. Do students meet the expectations/standards of performance as determined by the program and achieved the learning outcomes? [PLEASE MAKE SURE THE PLO YOU SPECIFY HERE IS THE SAME ONE YOU CHECKED/SPECIFIED IN Q1.1].

Q3.4.1. First PLO: [Critical Thinking]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

[NOTE: IF YOU HAVE MORE THAN ONE PLO, YOU NEED TO REPEAT THE TABLE IN Q3.4.1 UNTIL YOU INCLUDE ALL THE PLO(S) YOU ASSESSED IN 2013-2014.]

Q3.4.2. Second PLO: []

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

Question 4 (Q4): Evaluation of Data Quality: Reliability and Validity.

Q4.1. How many PLOs in total did your program assess in the 2013-2014 academic year? [One]

Q4.2. Please choose **ONE ASSESSED PLO** as an example to illustrate how you use direct, indirect, and/or other methods/measures to collect data. If you only assessed one PLO in 2013-14, YOU CAN SKIP this question. If you assessed MORE THAN ONE PLO, please check **ONLY ONE PLO BELOW EVEN IF YOU ASSESSED MORE THAN ONE PLO IN 2013-2014.**

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) ¹
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work

	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Other PLO. Specify:

Direct Measures

Q4.3. Were direct measures used to assess this PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q4.4)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q4.4)

Q4.3.1. Which of the following **DIRECT** measures were used? **[Check all that apply]**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2. Key assignments from other CORE classes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3. Key assignments from other classes
	4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques
	5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based projects
	6. E-Portfolios
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7. Other portfolios
	8. Other measure. Specify:

Q4.3.2. Please provide the direct measure(s) **[key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)]** that you used to collect the data. **[WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]**

Last year Ethnic Studies Department assessed Critical Thinking in all the four programs. This year as per the advice of Dr. Amy Liu, Director of University Assessment, the department assessed Critical Thinking in Content Mastery, Area C: Concepts and Theories/Old in Ethnic Studies 195B. This course is required of all majors and is our capstone course. While last year we used only one direct measure, this year we used three. Like in the past years students “were engaged in a number of assignments, which included critical analysis through writing and presentations. In addition these assignments, students were actively engaged in critical discourse and discussion in the classroom. In terms of writing, students completed a series of 8 reflection papers, and some of these assignments were connected to other courses required for all Ethnic Studies and majors.” The direct measures that were used are:

- 1) A paper completed by students in response to this question: “Critically evaluate Rita Cameron-Wedding’s article, *Defending Whiteness, Protecting White Privilege in Post-Civil Rights Society*, and discuss how the concept of color-blindness function to promote modern sanitized racism. In your discussion also compare your understanding of color-blindness with that of the author.”
- 2) Portfolios (please see 3 for more information)
- 3) The Portfolios that included students’ assignments related to critical thinking from these four CORE classes required of all majors: Ethnic 170, Ethnic 130/131, Ethnic 110, Ethnic 140.

Q4.3.2.1. Was the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the rubric/criterion?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.3. Was the direct measure (s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.4. How was the evidence scored/evaluated? [Select one only]

	1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (If checked, go to Q4.3.7)
	2. Use rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class
X	3. Use rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty
	4. Use rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty
	5. Use other means. Specify:

Q4.3.5. What rubric/criterion was adopted to score/evaluate the above key assignments/projects/portfolio? [Select one only]

X	1. The VALUE rubric(s)
	2. Modified VALUE rubric(s)
	3. A rubric that is totally developed by local faculty
	4. Use other means. Specify:

Q4.3.6. Was the rubric/criterion aligned directly with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.7. Were the evaluators (e.g., faculty or advising board members) who reviewed student work calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.8. Were there checks for inter-rater reliability?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.9. Were the sample sizes for the direct measure adequate?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.10. How did you select the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc)? Please briefly specify here:

We randomly selected 5 papers from Ethnic 195B and 5 papers from Ethnic 195B students' portfolios which contained amongst others papers from CORE classes. There were 28 students in Ethnic 195B

Indirect Measures

Q4.4. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q4.5)

Q4.4.1. Which of the following indirect measures were used?

	1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE, etc.)
	2. University conducted student surveys (OIR surveys)
	3. College/Department/program conducted student surveys
	4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	7. Others, specify:

Q4.4.2. If surveys were used, were the sample sizes adequate?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.4.3. If surveys were used, please briefly specify how you select your sample? What is the response rate?

Please see attached survey report by Dr. James Sobredo

Other Measures

Q4.5. Were external benchmarking data used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q4.6)

Q4.5.1. Which of the following measures was used?

	1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
	2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc)
	3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc)
	4. Others, specify:

Q4.6. Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (Go to Q4.7)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q4.7)

Q4.6.1. If yes, please specify: [N/A]

Alignment and Quality

Q4.7. Please describe how you collected the data? For example, in what course(s) (or by what means) were data collected? How reliable and valid is the data? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

The assessment was designed to evaluate Critical Thinking of Ethnic Studies Majors. Focusing on students in Ethnic 195B a required course of all majors, 10 papers were selected at random as follows:

- a) 5 papers completed in Ethnic 195B in response to the following question: "Critically evaluate Rita Cameron-Wedding's article, *Defending Whiteness, Protecting White Privilege in Post-Civil Rights Society*, and discuss how the concept of color-blindness function to promote modern sanitized racism. In your discussion also compare your understanding of color-blindness with that of the author."
- b) 5 papers from portfolios prepared by Ethnic 195B students. The papers specifically included assignments related to critical thinking from these four CORE classes required of all majors: Ethnic 170, Ethnic 130/131, Ethnic 110, and Ethnic 140.

The final score was determined based on an artifact analysis (essay question) of 10 students' papers according to the CTR criterion.

The direct measures that were used are:

- 1) A paper completed by students in response to this question: "Critically evaluate Rita Cameron-Wedding's article, *Defending Whiteness, Protecting White Privilege in Post-Civil Rights Society*, and discuss how the concept of color-blindness function to promote modern sanitized racism. In your discussion also compare your understanding of color-blindness with that of the author."
- 2) Portfolios (please see 3 for more information)
- 3) The Portfolios that included students' assignments related to critical thinking from these four CORE classes required of all majors: Ethnic 170, Ethnic 130/131, Ethnic 110, Ethnic 140.

Q4.8. How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO? [2]

NOTE: IF IT IS ONLY ONE, GO TO Q5.1.

Q4.8.1. Did the data (including all the assignments/projects/portfolios) from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.8.2. Were **ALL** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Question 5 (Q5): Use of Assessment Data.

Q5.1. To what extent have the assessment results **from 2012-2013** been used for? [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

	Very Much (1)	Quite a Bit (2)	S o m e (3)	N o t a t a l l (4)	No t A p p l i c a b l e (9)
1. Improving specific courses	X				

2. Modifying curriculum					
3. Improving advising and mentoring	X				
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals					
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations					
6. Developing/updating assessment plan					
7. Annual assessment reports					
8. Program review					
9. Prospective student and family information					
10. Alumni communication					
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)					
12. Program accreditation					
13. External accountability reporting requirement					
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations					
15. Strategic planning	X				
16. Institutional benchmarking					
17. Academic policy development or modification					
18. Institutional Improvement					
19. Resource allocation and budgeting					
20. New faculty hiring	X				
21. Professional					

development for faculty and staff					
22. Other Specify:					

Q5.1.1. Please provide one or two best examples to show how you have used the assessment data above.

1. We consistently make students aware of the learning goals at advising.
2. We also encourage students to save their assignments from other classes to have them available and handy for the portfolio preparation in Ethnic 195B as they reach the end of their undergraduate path.

Q5.2. As a result of the **assessment effort in 2013-2014** and based on the prior feedbacks from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of program learning outcomes)?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q5.3)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q5.3)

Q5.2.1. What changes are anticipated? By what mechanism will the changes be implemented? How and when will you assess the impact of proposed modifications? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

Not at this time.

Q5.2.2. Is there a follow-up assessment on these areas that need improvement?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q5.3. Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to program learning outcomes (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). If your program/academic unit has collected assessment data in this way, please briefly report your results here. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

Question 6 (Q6). Which program learning outcome(s) do you plan to assess next year?

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) ¹
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
X	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis

	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement - local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that the program is going to assess but not included above: a. b. c.

Part 3: Additional Information

A1. In which academic year did you **develop** the current assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
X	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet developed a formal assessment plan

A2. In which academic year did you last **update** your assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
X	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet updated the assessment plan

A3. Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A4. Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment of **student learning** occurs in the curriculum?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5. Does the program have any capstone class?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5.1. If yes, please list the course number for each capstone class: [Ethnic 195A. Ethnic 195B]

A6. Does the program have **ANY** capstone project?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

A7. Name of the academic unit: [Ethnic Studies]

A8. Department in which the academic unit is located: We are a Department in the College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies]

A9. Department Chair's Name: [Boatamo Mosupyoe]

A10. Total number of annual assessment reports submitted by your academic unit for 2013-2014: [1]

A11. College in which the academic unit is located:

	1. Arts and Letters
	2. Business Administration
	3. Education
	4. Engineering and Computer Science
	5. Health and Human Services
	6. Natural Science and Mathematics
X	7. Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies
	8. Continuing Education (CCE)
	9. Other, specify:

Undergraduate Degree Program(s):

A12. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: [6]

A12.1. List all the name(s): [1.) General Ethnic Studies, Concentrations in 2.) Asian American Studies; 3.) Chicano/a Latino/Studies; 4.) Education; 5.) Native American Studies; and 6.) Pan African Studies]

A12.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? [__6__]

Master Degree Program(s):

A13. Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: [N/A]

A13.1. List all the name(s): [N/A]

A13.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? [N/A]

Credential Program(s):

A14. Number of credential degree programs the academic unit has: [N/A]

A14.1. List all the names: [N/A]

Doctorate Program(s)

A15. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: [N/A]

A15.1. List the name(s): N/A]

A16. Would this assessment report apply to other program(s) and/or diploma concentration(s) in your academic unit*?

	1. Yes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2. No

*If the assessment conducted for this program (including the PLO(s), the criteria and standards of performance/expectations you established, the data you collected and analyzed, the conclusions of the assessment) is the same as the assessment conducted for other programs within the academic unit, you only need to submit one assessment report.

16.1. If yes, please specify the name of each program: _____

16.2. If yes, please specify the name of each diploma concentration: _____