

2015-2016 Annual Assessment Report Template

For instructions and guidelines visit our [website](#)
or [contact us](#) for more help.

Report:

Question 1: Program Learning Outcomes

Q1.1.

Which of the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs) **did you assess?** [Check all that apply]

- ☐ 1. Critical Thinking
- ☐ 2. Information Literacy
- ☐ 3. Written Communication
- ☐ 4. Oral Communication
- ☐ 5. Quantitative Literacy
- ☐ 6. Inquiry and Analysis
- ☐ 7. Creative Thinking
- ☐ 8. Reading
- ☐ 9. Team Work
- ☐ 10. Problem Solving
- ☐ 11. Civic Knowledge and Engagement
- ☒ 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, specify any assessed PLOs not included above:

- a.
- b.
- c.

Q1.2.

Please provide more detailed background information about **EACH PLO** you checked above and other information such as how your specific PLOs are **explicitly** linked to the Sac State BLGs:

Our PLGs and their accompanying PLOs are not based on the two University PLOs (= the AAC&U "Intercultural Knowledge" and "Global Learning" rubrics), and so there is no direct linkage between them; however, there is significant alignment.

The HRS Humanities M.A. program has two PLGs that fit well with the University PLO "Intercultural Knowledge and Competence" (AAC&U rubric), which emphasizes acquisition of cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills that support effective and appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts. Our PLG 1, "Knowledge of Human Cultures," which is very similar to elements of the University BLG "Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World," aligns well with "Intercultural Knowledge and Competence." Especially well aligned are our PLOs 1.1 and 1.3, which focus on the distinctive values and modes of expression in global cultures as well as on the comparative analysis of cultures. Our PLG 3, "Lifelong Learning," which connects well with the University BLG "Personal and Social Responsibility," fits nicely with "Intercultural Knowledge and Competence." Especially well aligned are our PLOs 3.4 and 3.5, which encourage reflection on "the diversity of communities and cultures" and the cultivation of an empathy that allows one to understand and adapt to the perspectives of others.

The program has two PLOs that align with the University PLO "Global Learning" (AAC&U rubric), which encourages students to become informed and open-minded people who understand and know how to act responsibly in the world's many diverse cultural settings. Our PLG 1, "Knowledge of Human Cultures," is clearly related to "Global Learning," and especially PLOs 1.1 and 1.3, which fit well with "Global Self-Awareness" (see the Benchmark and Milestone 2 descriptors). The same can be said of our PLG 3, "Lifelong Learning," and especially PLOs 3.4 and 3.5, which are clearly linked to the "Cultural Diversity" and "Perspective Taking" descriptors for "Global Learning."

Q1.2.1.

Do you have rubrics for your PLOs?

- ☐ 1. Yes, for all PLOs
- ☒ 2. Yes, but for some PLOs
- ☐ 3. No rubrics for PLOs
- ☐ 4. N/A
- ☐ 5. Other, specify:

Q1.3.

Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

Q1.4.

Is your program externally accredited (other than through WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC))?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☒ 2. No (skip to **Q1.5**)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q1.5**)

Q1.4.1.

If the answer to Q1.4 is **yes**, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

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

Q1.5.

Did your program use the *Degree Qualification Profile* (DQP) to develop your PLO(s)?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☒ 2. No, but I know what the DQP is
- ☐ 3. No, I don't know what the DQP is
- ☐ 4. Don't know

Q1.6.

Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

(**Remember:** Save your progress)

Question 2: Standard of Performance for the Selected PLO

Q2.1.

Select **ONE(1)** PLO here as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you *checked the correct box* for this PLO in Q1.1):

Q2.1.1.

Please provide more background information about the **specific PLO** you've chosen in Q2.1.

The Humanities M.A. program has two PLGs that align with the University PLO “Intercultural Knowledge and Competence” (AAC&U rubric), which emphasizes acquisition of cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills that support effective and appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts. Our PLG 1, “Knowledge of Human Cultures,” aligns well with “Intercultural Knowledge and Competence,” and especially PLOs 1.1 and 1.3, which focus on the distinctive values and modes of expression in global cultures as well as on the comparative analysis of cultures. Our PLG 3, “Lifelong Learning,” also fits well with “Intercultural Knowledge and Competence,” and especially PLO 3.3, which encourages reflection on the perspectives of others and the cultivation of an empathy that allows one to understand and adapt to the perspectives of others.

PLG 1: Knowledge of Human Cultures: Students who complete the M.A. in Humanities should be able to demonstrate knowledge of human cultures, their values, and forms of expression in ways that prepare them to understand, adapt, and succeed at levels appropriate to a graduate-level degree.

PLO 1.1: Explain the distinguishing values and prominent forms of literary and artistic expression of the major eras of Western and Asian cultures.

PLO 1.3: Compare two or more cultures, identifying common themes or issues along with those that are distinctive.

PLG 3: Lifelong Learning: Students who complete the M.A. in Humanities should be able to acquire advanced skills for lifelong learning for purposes of enhancing personal enrichment, intercultural awareness, and active engagement with the challenges and opportunities of the modern world.

PLO 3.3: Express, listen, and adapt ideas and messages based on others’ perspectives.

Q2.2.

Has the program developed or adopted **explicit** standards of performance for this PLO?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☒ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know
- ☐ 4. N/A

Q2.3.

Please **provide the rubric(s)** and **standards of performance** that you have developed for this PLO here or in the appendix.

AAC&U Rubric "Intercultural Knowledge and Competence" rubric is attached.

Because this is the first time we have assessed this PLO, we cannot yet establish with integrity a reasonable standard. We would welcome evidence that that might assist us in doing so (national surveys/studies of AAC&U scores).



InterculturalKnowledge.pdf
95.45 KB



No file attached

Q2.4. PLO	Q2.5. Stdnd	Q2.6. Rubric	Please indicate where you have published the PLO , the standard of performance, and the rubric that was used to measure the PLO:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. In ALL course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4. In the university catalogue
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5. On the academic unit website or in newsletters
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	6. In the assessment or program review reports, plans, resources, or activities
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	7. In new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	10. Other, specify: <input type="text"/>

Question 3: Data Collection Methods and Evaluation of Data Quality for the Selected PLO

Q3.1.

Was assessment data/evidence **collected** for the selected PLO?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No (skip to **Q6**)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q6**)
- ☐ 4. N/A (skip to **Q6**)

Q3.1.1.

How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO?

1

Q3.2.

Was the data **scored/evaluated** for this PLO?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No (skip to **Q6**)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q6**)
- ☐ 4. N/A (skip to **Q6**)

Q3.2.1.

Please describe how you collected the assessment data for the selected PLO. For example, in what course(s) or by what means were data collected:

HRS 296 Spring 2016 (Global Citizens) midterm papers, all three of which were reviewed by the three members of the assessment committee in order to determine scores per the Value Rubric.

(**Remember:** Save your progress)

Question 3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.)

Q3.3.

Were direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) used to assess this PLO?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No (skip to **Q3.7**)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q3.7**)

Q3.3.1.

Which of the following direct measures were used? [**Check all that apply**]

- ☐ 1. Capstone project (e.g. theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
- ☐ 2. Key assignments from required classes in the program
- ☒ 3. Key assignments from elective classes
- ☐ 4. Classroom based performance assessment such as simulations, comprehensive exams, or critiques
- ☐ 5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community-based projects
- ☐ 6. E-Portfolios
- ☐ 7. Other Portfolios
- ☐ 8. Other, specify:

Q3.3.2.

Please **explain** and **attach** the direct measure you used to collect data:

HRS 296 midterm assignment:

A 9-12 page paper explaining and critiquing the Fukuyama-Huntington debate and assessing the ways that Anthony Appiah's book, *Cosmopolitanism*, addresses this discourse.

(See Intercultural Knowledge and Competence VALUE Rubric, attached as Appendix 1.)

The assignment and associated readings appears on the HRS 296 syllabus (attached).



HRS 296 Syllabus.docx
1.42 MB



No file attached

Q3.4.

What tool was used to evaluate the data?

- ☐ 1. **No** rubric is used to interpret the evidence (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- ☐ 2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ☐ 3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ☐ 4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ☐ 5. The VALUE rubric(s) (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ☒ 6. Modified VALUE rubric(s) (skip to **Q3.4.2.**)
- ☐ 7. Used other means (Answer **Q3.4.1.**)

Q3.4.1.

If you used other means, which of the following measures was used? [**Check all that apply**]

- ☐ 1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- ☐ 2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.) (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- ☐ 3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.) (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)
- ☐ 4. Other, specify: (skip to **Q3.4.4.**)

Q3.4.2.

Was the **rubric** aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know
- ☐ 4. N/A

Q3.4.3.

Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the rubric**?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☒ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know
- ☐ 4. N/A

Q3.4.4.

Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☒ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know
- ☐ 4. N/A

Q3.5.

How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data **collection** of the selected PLO?

3

Q3.5.1.

How many faculty members participated in the **evaluation** of the assessment data for the selected PLO?

3

Q3.5.2.

If the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was scoring similarly)?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know
- ☐ 4. N/A

Q3.6.

How did you **select** the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc.)?

We selected the papers written by all three students in the seminar.

Q3.6.1.

How did you **decide** how many samples of student work to review?

Given the small number of students in the course, the only reasonable decision was to select all of them.

Q3.6.2.

How many students were in the class or program?

3

Q3.6.3.

How many samples of student work did you evaluated?

3

Q3.6.4.

Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate?

- ☐ 1. Yes

- ☐ 2. No
- ☒ 3. Don't know

(**Remember:** Save your progress)

Question 3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)

Q3.7.

Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☒ 2. No (skip to **Q3.8**)
- ☐ 3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8**)

Q3.7.1.

Which of the following indirect measures were used? [**Check all that apply**]

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

Q3.7.1.1.

Please explain and attach the indirect measure you used to collect data:

 No file attached

 No file attached

Q3.7.2.

If surveys were used, how was the sample size **decided**?

Q3.7.3.

If surveys were used, how did you **select** your sample:

Q3.7.4.

If surveys were used, what was the response rate?

Question 3C: Other Measures (external benchmarking, licensing exams, standardized tests, etc.)

Q3.8.

Were external benchmarking data, such as licensing exams or standardized tests, used to assess the PLO?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☒ 2. No (skip to **Q3.8.2**)
- ☐ 3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8.2**)

Q3.8.1.

Which of the following measures was used? [**Check all that apply**]

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

Q3.8.2.

Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☒ 2. No (skip to **Q4.1**)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q4.1**)

Q3.8.3.

If other measures were used, please specify:

 No file attached

 No file attached

(**Remember:** Save your progress)

Question 4: Data, Findings, and Conclusions

Q4.1.

Please provide simple tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions for the selected PLO for **Q2.1**:

"Intercultural Knowledge and Competence" rubric scores are attached.

HRS 296 Syllabus

HRS 296 Rubric Scores



HRS 296 Rubric scores.pdf
14.05 KB



No file attached

Q4.2.

Are students doing well and meeting the program standard? If not, how will the program work to improve student performance of the selected PLO?

Assuming "Capstone 2" describes the lowest acceptable level of proficiency for M.A. students, we can say that our students are doing well with respect to "Intercultural Knowledge and Competence." As stated above, we have not yet established a program standard. In order to improve student performance on this PLO, we can ensure that this PLO is more fully integrated into the design and delivery of our courses.



No file attached



No file attached

Q4.3.

For the selected PLO, the student performance:

- ☐ 1. **Exceeded** expectation/standard
- ☐ 2. **Met** expectation/standard
- ☒ 3. **Partially** met expectation/standard
- ☐ 4. Did not meet expectation/standard
- ☐ 5. No expectation/standard has been specified
- ☐ 6. Don't know

Question 4A: Alignment and Quality

Q4.4.

Did the data, including the direct measures, from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☒ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

Q4.5.

Were **all** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures of the PLO?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☒ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

Question 5: Use of Assessment Data (Closing the Loop)

Q5.1.

As a result of the assessment effort and based on prior feedback from OAPA, do you anticipate *making any changes* for your program (e.g. course structure, course content, or modification of PLOs)?

- ☒ 1. Yes

- ☐ 2. No (skip to **Q5.2**)
- ☐ 3. Don't know (skip to **Q5.2**)

Q5.1.1.

Please describe *what changes* you plan to make in your program as a result of your assessment of this PLO. Include a description of how you plan to assess the impact of these changes.

In past years, we used University (= AAC&U) PLOs that aligned very closely with our own programmatic PLOs. This made assessment easier and more rewarding. The University PLOs we chose this year did not fit nearly as well with our programmatic PLOs. For example, their emphasis on using knowledge of cultural traditions in order to act effectively, responsibly, and ethically in diverse cultural settings fits very well with respect to knowledge but not nearly as well with respect to action.

For this reason, we do not intend to use the University (= AAC&U) rubrics. Instead, we intend to develop our own rubrics, which will be directly aligned with our own PLOs.

This year's assessment process did not yield sufficient information to justify making major changes.

Q5.1.2.

Do you have a plan to assess the *impact of the changes* that you anticipate making?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

Q5.2.

How have the assessment data from the last annual assessment been used so far? [**Check all that apply**]

	1. Very Much	2. Quite a Bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A
1. Improving specific courses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Modifying curriculum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Improving advising and mentoring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Developing/updating assessment plan	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Annual assessment reports	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Program review	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Prospective student and family information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
10. Alumni communication	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
11. WSCUC accreditation (regional accreditation)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
12. Program accreditation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
13. External accountability reporting requirement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
15. Strategic planning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16. Institutional benchmarking	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
17. Academic policy development or modifications	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
18. Institutional improvement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
19. Resource allocation and budgeting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
20. New faculty hiring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
21. Professional development for faculty and staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22. Recruitment of new students	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

23. Other, specify:

Q5.2.1.

Please provide a detailed example of how you used the assessment data above:

A new feature relating to Information Literacy has been added to HRS 200A, a first-year introductory course required for all students in the M.A. program. There is now discussion of types, locations, and effective use of source materials in the first class session. Thereafter, students submit lists of sources they intend to use for their research projects. These are scrutinized by and then discussed with the instructor.

(**Remember:** Save your progress)

Additional Assessment Activities

Q6.

Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspect of their program *that are not related to the PLOs* (i.e. impacts of an advising center, etc.). **If** your program/academic unit has collected data on program *elements*, please briefly report your results here:



No file attached



No file attached

Q7.

What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year? [**Check all that apply**]

- ☐ 1. Critical Thinking
- ☐ 2. Information Literacy
- ☐ 3. Written Communication
- ☐ 4. Oral Communication
- ☐ 5. Quantitative Literacy
- ☐ 6. Inquiry and Analysis
- ☐ 7. Creative Thinking
- ☒ 8. Reading
- ☐ 9. Team Work
- ☐ 10. Problem Solving
- ☐ 11. Civic Knowledge and Engagement
- ☐ 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, specify any PLOs not included above:

a.

b.

c.

Q8. Please attach any additional files here:



No file attached



No file attached



No file attached



No file attached

Q8.1.

Have you attached any files to this form? If yes, please list every attached file here:

"Intercultural Knowledge and Competence" rubric.

HRS 296 Syllabus

HRS 296 Rubric Scores

Program Information (**Required**)

P1.

Program/Concentration Name(s): [by degree]

MA Humanities & Religious Studies

P1.1.

Program/Concentration Name(s): [by department]

Humanities & Religious Studies MA

P2.

Report Author(s):

Brad Nystrom, Jeffrey Brodd, Harvey Stark

P2.1.

Department Chair/Program Director:

Brad Nystrom

P2.2.

Assessment Coordinator:

Harvey Stark

P3.

Department/Division/Program of Academic Unit

Humanities & Religious Studies

P4.

College:

College of Arts & Letters

P5.

Total enrollment for Academic Unit during assessment semester (see Departmental Fact Book):

11 graduate students enrolled in

P6.

Program Type:



1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major



2. Credential



3. Master's Degree



4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.D./Ed.S./D.P.T./etc.)



5. Other, specify:

P7. Number of **undergraduate degree programs** the academic unit has?

2

P7.1. List all the names:

B.A. Humanities

B.A. Humanities (Religious Studies concentration)

P7.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?

1

P8. Number of **master's degree programs** the academic unit has?

1

P8.1. List all the names:

M.A. Humanities

P8.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master's program?

0

P9. Number of **credential programs** the academic unit has?

0

P9.1. List all the names:

P10. Number of **doctorate degree programs** the academic unit has?

0

P10.1. List all the names:

When was your assessment plan ...	1. Before 2010-11	2. 2011-12	3. 2012-13	4. 2013-14	5. 2014-15	6. No Plan	7. Don't know
P11. developed?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
P11.1. last updated?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

P11.3.

Please attach your latest **assessment plan**:

 No file attached


P12.

Has your program developed a **curriculum map**?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☒ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

P12.1.

Please attach your latest **curriculum map**:

 No file attached

P13.

Has your program indicated in the curriculum map where assessment **of student learning** occurs?

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

P14.

Does your program have a capstone class?

- ☒ 1. Yes, indicate:
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

P14.1.

Does your program have **any** capstone project?

- ☒ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Don't know

(**Remember: Save your progress**)

INTERCULTURAL KNOWLEDGE AND COMPETENCE VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can be shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

Definition

Intercultural Knowledge and Competence is "a set of cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills and characteristics that support effective and appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts." (Bennett, J. M. 2008. Transformative training: Designing programs for culture learning. In *Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence: Understanding and utilizing cultural diversity to build successful organizations*, ed. M. A. Moodian, 95-110. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.)

Framing Language

The call to integrate intercultural knowledge and competence into the heart of education is an imperative born of seeing ourselves as members of a world community, knowing that we share the future with others. Beyond mere exposure to culturally different others, the campus community requires the capacity to: meaningfully engage those others, place social justice in historical and political context, and put culture at the core of transformative learning. The intercultural knowledge and competence rubric suggests a systematic way to measure our capacity to identify our own cultural patterns, compare and contrast them with others, and adapt empathically and flexibly to unfamiliar ways of being.

The levels of this rubric are informed in part by M. Bennett's Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (Bennett, M.J. 1993. Towards ethno relativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In *Education for the intercultural experience*, ed. R. M. Paige, 22-71. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press). In addition, the criteria in this rubric are informed in part by D.K. Deardorff's intercultural framework which is the first research-based consensus model of intercultural competence (Deardorff, D.K. 2006. The identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 10(3): 241-266). It is also important to understand that intercultural knowledge and competence is more complex than what is reflected in this rubric. This rubric identifies six of the key components of intercultural knowledge and competence, but there are other components as identified in the Deardorff model and in other research.

Glossary

The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.

- Culture: All knowledge and values shared by a group.
- Cultural rules and biases: Boundaries within which an individual operates in order to feel a sense of belonging to a society or group, based on the values shared by that society or group.
- Empathy: "Empathy is the imaginary participation in another person's experience, including emotional and intellectual dimensions, by imagining his or her perspective (not by assuming the person's position)". Bennett, J. 1998. Transition shock: Putting culture shock in perspective. In *Basic concepts of intercultural communication*, ed. M. Bennett, 215-224. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Intercultural experience: The experience of an interaction with an individual or groups of people whose culture is different from your own.
- Intercultural/ cultural differences: The differences in rules, behaviors, communication and biases, based on cultural values that are different from one's own culture.
- Suspends judgment in valuing their interactions with culturally different others: Postpones assessment or evaluation (positive or negative) of interactions with people culturally different from one self. Disconnecting from the process of automatic judgment and taking time to reflect on possibly multiple meanings.
- Worldview: Worldview is the cognitive and affective lens through which people construe their experiences and make sense of the world around them.

INTERCULTURAL KNOWLEDGE AND COMPETENCE VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



Definition

Intercultural Knowledge and Competence is "a set of cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills and characteristics that support effective and appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts." (Bennett, J. M. 2008. Transformative training: Designing programs for culture learning. In *Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence: Understanding and utilizing cultural diversity to build successful organizations*, ed. M. A. Moodian, 95-110. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.)

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

	Capstone 4	Milestones 32		Benchmark 1
Knowledge <i>Cultural self-awareness</i>	Articulates insights into own cultural rules and biases (e.g. seeking complexity; aware of how her/his experiences have shaped these rules, and how to recognize and respond to cultural biases, resulting in a shift in self-description.)	Recognizes new perspectives about own cultural rules and biases (e.g. not looking for sameness; comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer.)	Identifies own cultural rules and biases (e.g. with a strong preference for those rules shared with own cultural group and seeks the same in others.)	Shows minimal awareness of own cultural rules and biases (even those shared with own cultural group(s)) (e.g. uncomfortable with identifying possible cultural differences with others.)
Knowledge <i>Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks</i>	Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Demonstrates adequate understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Demonstrates partial understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Demonstrates surface understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.
Skills <i>Empathy</i>	Interprets intercultural experience from the perspectives of own and more than one worldview and demonstrates ability to act in a supportive manner that recognizes the feelings of another cultural group.	Recognizes intellectual and emotional dimensions of more than one worldview and sometimes uses more than one worldview in interactions.	Identifies components of other cultural perspectives but responds in all situations with own worldview.	Views the experience of others but does so through own cultural worldview.
Skills <i>Verbal and nonverbal communication</i>	Articulates a complex understanding of cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication (e.g., demonstrates understanding of the degree to which people use physical contact while communicating in different cultures or use direct/indirect and explicit/implicit meanings) and is able to skillfully negotiate a shared understanding based on those differences.	Recognizes and participates in cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication and begins to negotiate a shared understanding based on those differences.	Identifies some cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication and is aware that misunderstandings can occur based on those differences but is still unable to negotiate a shared understanding.	Has a minimal level of understanding of cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication; is unable to negotiate a shared understanding.
Attitudes <i>Curiosity</i>	Asks complex questions about other cultures, seeks out and articulates answers to these questions that reflect multiple cultural perspectives.	Asks deeper questions about other cultures and seeks out answers to these questions.	Asks simple or surface questions about other cultures.	States minimal interest in learning more about other cultures.
Attitudes <i>Openness</i>	Initiates and develops interactions with culturally different others. Suspends judgment in valuing her/his interactions with culturally different others.	Begins to initiate and develop interactions with culturally different others. Begins to suspend judgment in valuing her/his interactions with culturally different others.	Expresses openness to most, if not all, interactions with culturally different others. Has difficulty suspending any judgment in her/his interactions with culturally different others, and is aware of own judgment and expresses a willingness to change.	Receptive to interacting with culturally different others. Has difficulty suspending any judgment in her/his interactions with culturally different others, but is unaware of own judgment.

**HRS 296 Global Citizens
Spring 2016
Wednesdays 5:30-8:20PM
Professor Harvey Stark
Mendocino Hall 1024**

Contact Info:

Office: MND 2028

Email: harvey.stark@csus.edu

Office Hours: Tuesdays & Thursdays 1-2:30PM or by appointment

Office Telephone: 278-6261

Global Citizens

This seminar is exploration of how “the global” is conceptualized in an age with competing notions of the individual and the community. Special emphasis will be placed on race, class, ethnicity & gender to elucidate the many paths that thought, language, and identity take when traversing borders.

Class Structure:

This is primarily a discussion course and so I will try and keep lectures to a minimum. Class interaction through reading and presentations will create the substance of the course.

Goals of Class Discussions:

Class is an important opportunity to discuss the week’s themes and readings. It is a chance for us to think critically and question some of our own assumptions. When possible will aim at a thoughtful and thought-provoking discussion. You should develop a sense of responsibility for class discussion, making sure it is robust, on-topic and well thought out. We will cover a lot of material each week and you should approach the readings with the goal of allowing certain sources to speak to you, challenge you, and inspire further reflection. Our discussions will be shaped, by questions and ideas you bring to class. While we will generally stick to the course outline, I may change readings or subject matter to better address your concerns or interests.

Readings:

Reading is the most important element of class. Careful reading will help you to study for exams, participate in class, and enhance your overall understanding of the subject matter. On average you will have 180 pages of reading per week, combining primary and secondary text. As the relaying of stories is an important part of religion, I have done my best to provide you with texts that tell a story. When reading be strategic by identifying the themes and purpose of a given selection and discovering how authors achieve their goals. When you find something in the readings that seems vulnerable to criticism, try to formulate the criticism, but then try to imagine how the author might want to respond to your question or objection. This type of critical thinking will help you when formulating essays and research papers.

** - Please be aware that the reading for any given week may change, and I will inform you of these changes in advance.*

Class Requirements & Grading:

Participation & weekly reflections 20%: Participating is a crucial part of a class this size. Your participation grade has two components: 1) Weekly reflections (posted to the wiki on SacCT the day before class). These should include a question about the text for the week and an explanation of that question (no need to exceed 250 words). 2) Active participation, which includes actively and thoughtfully contributing to the conversation, as well as actively listening and respecting your classmates' input. Articulating ideas through participation will help you to formulate ideas and reinforce reading material.

Presentation and Class Led Discussion 10% & Corresponding paper 15%: Each student will present the readings and author for one week's class and spearhead and run class discussion. This will include a 1-2 page biographical sketch of the author and a 3-5 page essay on the relationship between the author's biography and the work being read.

Midterm Paper 20% Upload to SacCT by Friday, February 26 @ 11:59PM: A 9-12 page paper explaining and critiquing the Fukuyama-Huntington debate and assessing the ways that Anthony Appiah's book, *Cosmopolitanism*, addresses this discourse. **Late Papers:** Papers turned in after the deadline will lose 1/3 grade (A to A-; A- to B+; B+ to B, etc.) for each 24-hour period late up until the end of the second day. Papers turned in any time after the end of the second day will lose 1 full letter grade (A to B; A- to B-, etc.)

Final Paper Presentation 5% Due in class on May 11 (Send to me via email and bring 5 hard copies to class): Two weeks before your final papers are due there will be an informal presentation session for your paper ideas accompanied by a one-page paragraph of explanation and a short bibliography. The main objective is to help you frame your ideas in preparation for writing the paper.

Final Paper 30% Upload to SacCT by Friday, May 20 @ 11:59PM: A 15-20 page paper discussing one of the novels that we have read this semester and placing it in its relevant historical and political context. These paper should discuss a central theme of the chosen novel (gender, race, class, politics, etc.), how the author presents and discusses this theme, the author's argument, and the accuracy with which he/she has presented historical and political events. **Late Papers:** Papers turned in after the deadline will lose 1/3 grade (A to A-; A- to B+; B+ to B, etc.) for each 24-hour period late.

Explanation of Grading:

All assignments will be given letter grades. The following, partially taken from the CSUS website (<http://catalog.csus.edu/12-14/first%20100%20pages/academicpolicies.html>), helps to define what each letter means:

A - *Excellent* achievement of the course objectives. In addition to being clearly and significantly above the requirements, work exhibited is of an independent, creative, and contributory nature.

B – *Very Good* achievement of the course objectives. The performance is clearly and significantly above the satisfactory fulfillment of course requirements.

C - *Satisfactory* achievement of the course objectives. A C shows evidence of effort, but only modest success in meeting the course expectations.

D - *Unsatisfactory* achievement of course objectives, yet achievement of a sufficient proportion of the objectives so that it is not necessary to repeat the course unless required to do so by the academic department. A D is minimally acceptable in the sense that it barely counts as a completion

F - *Unsatisfactory* achievement of course objectives to an extent that the student must repeat the course to receive credit.

Plus - Shows effort and achievement that goes somewhat beyond the standards expressed above for each letter category.

Minus - Shows effort and achievement that is somewhat below the standards expressed for each letter category.

Statement on Academic Integrity

Plagiarism and academic dishonesty constitute serious offenses that undermine your education and violate Sacramento State's policy on academic integrity and may result in penalties ranging from a lowered grade to course failure. All work submitted in this class must be your own, and must be completed specifically for this class. You may not turn in work previously written for another class. Any use of another's work without proper attribution constitutes plagiarism. Plagiarism ranges from copying someone else's work word for word, to rewriting someone else's work with only minor word changes (mosaic plagiarism), to summarizing work without acknowledging the source. For more information see the library's page on plagiarism: (<http://library.csus.edu/content2.asp?pageID=353>)

Expectations:

Attendance: I will not be taking attendance, but excessive lateness and/or absence will negatively affect your performance on exams as well as the participation component of your grade.

Preparation: Being prepared means you have read and taken notes on all of the week's required reading assignments, have arrived to class with all of the relevant texts, and have brought questions and ideas to class that are important to you, prepared to discuss a range of issues. On occasion I will give you a list of "terms to define/identify" before a week's readings. You should come to class aware of these definitions, having used your class texts and outside materials if necessary.

Laptops & Cell Phones: Laptops and cell phones are not allowed during class. We should be listening and commenting, keeping a good focus on the direction of the conversation. As we all know, laptops and cell phones can be a serious means of distraction for you and those around you.

Office Hours: Outside of our weekly class sessions, I will be available to address any questions, concerns or suggestions you have by e-mail and during office hours (it is best to make an appointment). I will do my best to respond to your e-mails within 24 hours on weekdays. I will typically respond to weekend emails on Mondays. I encourage you to meet with me to discuss questions you might have about the course material or your broader interests.

Accommodations for Recognized Disabilities: I will make every effort to accommodate your needs as they apply to the above policies. Please come see me in the event that you will need special accommodation so that we can figure out an acceptable solution.

I'm looking forward to a rich and exciting semester.

Books:

Chinua Achebe, *Things Fall Apart*, Anchor Books, 1994.

Chinua Achebe was a Nigerian novelist, poet, professor, and critic. His first novel *Things Fall Apart* was considered his magnum opus, and is the most widely read book in modern African literature. Although a work of fiction, the story told in this book helps give insight into African religion and its eventual encounter with Christianity through colonial expansion.



Kwame Anthony Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*, W.W. Norton & Co, 2007.

Kwame Anthony Appiah was born in London, but moved as an infant to Ghana, where he grew up. His father, Joseph Emmanuel Appiah, a lawyer and politician, was also, at various times, a Member of Parliament, an Ambassador and a President of the Ghana Bar Association; his mother, the novelist and children's writer, Peggy Appiah, whose family was English, was active in the social, philanthropic and cultural life of Kumasi. Their marriage, in 1953, was widely covered in the international press, because it was one of the first "inter-racial society weddings" in Britain. In January 2014 he took up an appointment as Professor of Philosophy and Law at New York University, where he teaches both in New York and in Abu Dhabi and at other NYU global centers. The book *Cosmopolitanism* is Appiah's answer to the contemporary world and the ethics necessary for balancing the global and the particular.



Bridget Cooks, *Exhibiting Blackness: African Americans and the American Art Museum*, University of Massachusetts Press, 2011.

Bridget R. Cooks is Associate Professor at UC Irvine in the Program in African American Studies and the Department of Art History. Her research focuses on African American art and culture, Black visual culture, museum criticism, film, feminist theory and post-colonial theory. In *Exhibiting Blackness* Cooks analyzes the curatorial strategies & challenges of the most significant museum exhibitions of African American art. *Exhibiting Blackness* examines the unequal and often contested relationship between African American artists, curators, and visitors, and she provides insight into the role of art museums and their accountability to the cultures they represent.



Edwige Danticat, *Breath, Eyes, Memory*. Vintage 1998.

Edwige Danticat was born in Port-au-Prince Haiti in 1969. She holds a Master of Fine Arts in creative writing from Brown University—her thesis, entitled "My turn in the fire – an abridged novel", was the basis for her novel *Breath, Eyes, Memory*. Among other things, *Breath, Eyes, Memory* is an exploration of the Haitian experience with immigration and border crossings, which challenges the notion of fixed cultural citizenship.



Ghassan Kanafani, *Palestine's Children: Returning to Haifa & Other Stories*. Lynne Rienner 2000.

Ghassan Kanafani was born in 1936 in Akka, Palestine. He was a writer and a leading member of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine. On July 8, 1972 he was assassinated by the Mossad (Israeli secret service). Much of his writing focuses on the political and military struggle of the Palestinian people. "Returning to Haifa" and the other stories in *Palestine's Children*, captures the Palestinian struggle to contend with the loss of homeland both physically and mentally.



Toni Morrison, *Tar Baby*, Vintage, 2004.

Toni Morrison is an American novelist, editor, and professor. She has authored numerous, winning the Pulitzer Prize and the American Book Award in 1988, the Nobel Prize in 1993, and the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 2012. Through the love story of its two main characters, the novel *Tar Baby* addresses the diversity of the African American experience with race, gender, and class, moving from the Caribbean to Manhattan and the deep South.



Salman Rushdie, *Midnight's Children*, Random House, 2006.

Salman Rushdie is a British-Indian novelist best known for the novels *Midnight's Children* (1981) and *The Satanic Verses* (1988), for which he was accused of blasphemy against Islam.



He attended King's College at the University of Cambridge, where he studied history. After graduating, he spent time working in television and a brief period as a copywriter for an advertising agency, before pursuing a career as a writer. Through its use of “magical realism” and its main character Saleem Sinai, *Midnight's Children* presents India, Indian history, and Indian culture through the lens of partition, independence, and colonialism.

Tayeb Salih, *Season of Migration to the North*. New York Review of Books, 2009.

Tayeb Salih (1929-2009) was born in Karmakol, Sudan. He was one of Sudan's most



illustrious literary figures. For many years Salih wrote a weekly column for the London-based Arabic language newspaper *al Majalla*. He worked for the BBC's Arabic Service and later became director general of the Ministry of Information in Doha, Qatar. *Season of Migration to the North* was originally published in 1969. It is the story of a young man who returns to Northern Sudan after studying in Europe and finds himself a stranger in his own country as he attempts to help it through its postcolonial existence.

Cornell West, *Race Matters*, Random House 2001.

Cornel West is public intellectual and scholar of race, religion, and philosophy. He has taught at Princeton, Union Theological Seminary, Yale, Harvard and the University of Paris. He has



written 19 books and edited 13 books. He is best known for his books *Race Matters* and *Democracy Matters*. His website bio says that he “has a passion to communicate to a vast variety of publics in order to keep alive the legacy of Martin Luther King, Jr. – a legacy of telling the truth and bearing witness to love and justice.” *Race Matters*, less dense and philosophical than some of his other work, engages with the African American experience and some of the ways that race frames American society.

Course Outline

January 27: The End of History or The Clash of Civilizations?

See Blackboard for:

Francis Fukuyama, "The End of History?" *The National Interest*, Summer 1989

Samuel Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations," *Foreign Affairs*, Summer 1993, pp. 22-49

February 3: Cosmopolitanism

Reading: Kwame Anthony Appiah: *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*

See Blackboard for:

Michel de Certeau, "Walking in the City" in *The Practice of Everyday Life*, pp. 91-110

February 10: Partition & the End of Colonialism

Reading: *Midnight's Children*, Book One

See Blackboard for:

Excerpts from the writings of Ghandi, Nehru, & Jinnah

Salman Rushdie, *Imaginary Homelands*, pp. 9-21

February 17: Partition & the End of Colonialism (continued)

Reading: *Midnight's Children*, Book Two

February 24: Partition & the End of Colonialism (continued)

Reading: *Midnight's Children*, Book Three

Midterm Paper Due Friday, February 26

March 2: Palestine the Other Partition

Reading: *Palestine's Children: Returning to Haifa & Other Stories*.

See Blackboard for:

Interview with Edward Said in *Imaginary Homelands*, pp. 166-184

March 9: Africa/Arabia: The Postcolonial Experiment

Reading: *Season of Migration to the North*

See Blackboard for:

Ali Mazrui, *The African Condition: A Political Diagnosis*, Lecture 3

March 16: Africa and Story Telling

Reading: *Things Fall Apart Part*

Spring Break (No Class March 23)

March 30: America, Slavery, and the African Diaspora

See Blackboard for:

Judith Weisenfeld, "My Story Begins before I Was Born: Myth, History, and Power in Julie Dash's *Daughters of the Dust*," in *Representing Religion in World Cinema: Filmmaking, Mythmaking, Culture Making*, edited by S. Brent Plate, 43-66

In class film: *Daughters of the Dust*

April 6: Race in America

Reading: *Race Matters*

See Blackboard for:

Excerpts from Cornell West's, *Prophecy Deliverance* 5-10, 69-91

April 13: Race in America: Seeing the Global through the Eyes of the Local

Reading: *Tar Baby*, Part I

April 20: Race in America: Seeing the Global through the Eyes of the Local

Reading: *Tar Baby*, Part II

April 27: Institutions, Race, and Cultural Accountability

Reading: *Exhibiting Blackness: African Americans and the American Art Museum*

May 4: Immigration and Cultural Border Crossings

Reading: *Breath, Eyes, Memory*

May 11: Paper Presentations

Final Paper Due Friday, May 20

HRS 296 (H. Stark) midterm papers, Spring 2016

Intercultural Knowledge and Competence

	#1	#2	#3	Average
K1	2.0	3.7	2.5	3.0
K2	2.0	3.7	2.5	3.0
S1	2.0	3.7	2.3	2.9
S2	NA	NA	NA	NA
A1	2.2	3.7	2.3	2.9
A2	1.5	4.0	3.0	3.1
Average	1.9	3.7	2.5	3.0