

Program: Chicano Studies

Date report completed: 5/31/17

Completed by: Fawn-Amber Montoya

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program’s assessment): _____

PART I. Program student learning outcomes (SLOs) assessed in this cycle, processes, results, and recommendations for improved student learning.

| A. Which of the program SLOs were assessed during this cycle? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan. | B. When was this SLO last assessed? Please indicate the semester and year. | C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process. | D. Who was assessed? Please fully describe the student group(s) and the number of students or artifacts involved. | E. What is the expected achievement level and how many or what proportion of students should be at that level? | F. What were the results of the assessment? | G. What were the department’s conclusions about student performance? | H. What changes/improvements to the <u>program</u> are planned based on this assessment? |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|---|---|
| 4. Examine and interpret how Chicanos have impacted the culture, politics, and history of Southern Colorado. | June 2013 | Assessment questions the first and last week of one CS 101 section | Students in the Intro to CS 101 course. 16 students in week 1 and 9 students in week 15 | Expected that 85% of students should have a level 2- moderate detail in their explanation of these term | 66% of the students were at a level 2- moderate detail in the explanation of their terms | Students did not mention at all the impact that Chicanos had on politics and low on the connection to Colorado. These items were covered in the course. Subjective questioning and open ended assessment may not be the best method for this type of evaluation | Need to develop a better model for assessment. Faculty have created a multiple choice response with students having a range for their responses. Politics should be a specific unit in the CS 101 course. |
| | | | | | | | |

Comments on part I: CS 101 has been developed as a Hybrid and online course in 2016/2017. There is potential to offer one CS 101 online course a year and one online course a semester. There have been fewer students sign up for the hybrid course and a lower rate of retention for this courses. These specific sections were not addressed this year. There is a need to assess the online courses in the future.

PART II. Follow-up (closing the loop) on results and activities from previous assessment cycles. In this section, please describe actions taken during this 2016-2017 cycle that were based on, or implemented to address, the results of assessment from previous cycles.

| A. What SLO(s) did you address? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan. | B. When was this SLO last assessed? Please indicate the semester and year. | C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment? | D. Were the recommendations for change acted upon? If not, why? | E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations? |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| Students will demonstrate inclusiveness and diversity within their respective majors by analyzing the complexities of Chicano identity, and evaluating the contribution of women within Chicano history. | Spring 2016 | Include more of the perspective of women in the Intro to Chicano Studies course. Include more assignments and course materials on the roles of women We need to have data on all CS 101 courses | Changes were not acted upon. Adjunct instructors do not have graduate coursework in Women's Studies or specifically in the experiences of women in Chicano History. | Recommendations would be to have adjunct faculty assign text specifically on the experiences of Women in Chicano History. Continue to push for 1 syllabi for all CS 101 courses. Fall 17 semester there will be new faculty teaching in CS. Current Coordinator will encourage the use of one syllabus for all CS 101 courses. |
| | | | | |

Comments on part II: CS 101 faculty have changed in the past 2 years. There is less of an emphasis on the complexities of Chicano Identity and the role of women. There is a need to evaluate the use of the term Latino on a national level and how this fits within the context of the CS curriculum.

2016/2017 assessment rubric for Chicano Studies.

4. Examine and interpret how Chicanos have impacted the culture, politics, and history of Southern Colorado.

CS 101 pre-Assessment looked for 6 key terms, Mexico, Hispanic Colorado, History, Culture, Politics

Rubric

| Key terms | Frequency – in number of assessments- pre 16 responses | Frequency – in number of assessments- Post 10- responses | Level of detail- 0-Not mentioned 1-mentioned 2-Explanation 3- detailed explanation Pre | Level of detail- 0-Not mentioned 1-mentioned 2-Explanation 3- detailed explanation post |
|-----------|---|---|--|---|
| Mexico | 8 | 8 | 1 | 2 |
| Hispanic | 6 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Colorado | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| History | 19 | 26 | 1 | 2 |
| culture | 28 | 7 | 1 | 2 |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| Politics | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| Total Terms mentioned/respondents | 62/16 3.875 terms per respondent | 46/10 4.6 terms Per respondent | 5/18 Range could have been as high as 18 | 9/18 Range could have been as high as 18 |

There were 6 key terms that the assessor looked for in a short essay response from a student. With 16 student responses, the terms showed up 62 times at the beginning of the spring semester, but there was only a mentioning of these terms with no explanation. The average number of terms listed was 3.875 terms per student. In the post-assessment, at the end of the spring semester, there were only 10 respondents with an average of 4.6 terms used per student. The level of detail in the 6 terms used before the semester started was 5, with a range as high as 18 or at 27% of the possible, and in the post-assessment, the level of detail was at 9, with a range as high as 18 or 50% of the highest possible. In the post-assessment, 4 out of 6 terms (66%) were registered as being a level 2.