

# University Summary Report: Diversity and Social Justice Assessment of Student Learning for Graduate Programs

December 18, 2022, version 1

## INTRODUCTION

### Purpose

[Institutional Learning Outcomes \(ILOs\)](#) are those learning outcomes that are expected of every graduate of the institution, both undergraduate and graduate, and are closely aligned with [General Education](#) requirements. ILO Assessment follows the [ILO Long Term Assessment Plan](#) which aligns the assessment schedule for undergraduate, graduate, and the [GE Long-Term Assessment Plan](#).

Following the ILO Long Term Assessment schedule, Cal State East Bay gathered recent student learning data to support the assessment of the University's Diversity and Social Justice Institutional Learning Outcomes. These data are intended to provide additional context for existing "Closing the Loop" academic review discussions, analysis, and decision making to improve student learning.

### Overview of Diversity and Social Justice

Graduate students would be expected to have mastered general Diversity and Social Justice skills as part of their undergraduate degree. Diversity and Social Justice goals in graduate programs would then be aimed at developing and mastering discipline-specific skills such as advocacy of equitable practices in specific environments (e.g., educational, child welfare, juvenile justice, tribal organizations, etc.), promotion of professional services to diverse populations, curriculum design to reflect multiple knowledge perspectives, or adherence to policies and procedures required by legislation or accreditation. Development of these discipline-specific Diversity and Social Justice skills is completed within major courses in a student's degree major. Students who have not mastered general Diversity and Social Justice skills prior to admission may address that deficiency by completing courses which fulfill the undergraduate GE Diversity and Social Justice overlay requirement or by completing major-specific courses incorporating Diversity and Social Justice in programs where those courses are available.

## METHODS

CSUEB Academic Senate policy requires that each graduate program align to at least two university ILOs, as specified in the ILO Long-Term Assessment Plan. All graduate programs have submitted ILO-PLO mappings to indicate the ILOs to which they would align, and these alignments are available on the College assessment web pages.

There is wide variation in the goals of the various graduate programs with respect to the Diversity and Social Justice ILOs even within a single shared criterion. For instance, for the “Reflection on Interaction with Diverse People and Perspectives” Diversity ILO criterion, one program assesses whether a student shows inherent understanding of how cultural diversity shapes a multi-layered historical record, while another assesses whether the student demonstrates strong evidence of addressing the criterion in a client’s clinical treatment plan. In addition, some programs are subject to outside accreditation organizations which specify their own criteria and rubrics for assessing Diversity and Social Justice skills. As a result, each aligned graduate program was asked to specify rubrics to be used to assess the Diversity and Social Justice ILOs. Programs could choose to use the university rubric developed to assess undergraduate work, modify the university rubric, develop their own discipline-specific rubric, or use a rubric specified by an outside accrediting agency. This process is in contrast to the assessment of ILOs in the undergraduate programs where a common university rubric is used to assess all undergraduate work across all programs for each ILO.

Each aligned graduate program identified one or more graduate courses in which the ILO was to be assessed, and the instructor of the course was asked to identify or develop an assignment that could be effectively used for assessment purposes. Individual programs decided how many samples they would gather in each assessed course and also identified faculty members responsible for applying the specified rubrics to generate the assessment data. The results of the assessment efforts were provided in each program's annual report to the Academic Senate [Committee on Academic Planning and Review \(CAPR\)](#) and to the [Office of Graduate Studies](#).

**Assessment of Graduate Level ILO Diversity and Social Justice Student Work 2021- 2022**

Nine of the thirty-five graduate programs at CSUEB chose to align one or more of their Program Learning Outcomes with the Diversity ILO and hence participated in assessment of that ILO in 2021-2022. Programs from two of the four CSUEB colleges were represented.

Table 1. Numbers of programs aligned by college for Diversity ILO 2021-22.

College	Programs Represented	# Programs Aligned to Diversity ILO
CBE	None	0
CEAS	Counseling - School Counseling concentration - School Psychology concentration - Marriage and Family Therapy concentration Elearning	6

	Educational Technology Reading and Literacy	
CLASS	History Social Work Speech Language and Hearing Sciences	3
CSCI	None	0

Nine of the thirty-five graduate programs at CSUEB chose to align one or more of their Program Learning Outcomes with the Social Justice ILO and hence participated in assessment of that ILO in 2021-2022. Programs from two of the four CSUEB colleges were represented.

College	Programs Represented	# Programs Aligned to Social Justice ILO
CBE	None	0
CEAS	Counseling - Marriage and Family Therapy concentration Curriculum and Instruction (?) Early Childhood Education Educational Leadership (M.S.) Educational Leadership (Ed.D.) Hospitality, Recreation and Leadership Kinesiology Special Education	8
CLASS	Social Work	1
CSCI	None	0

No common process was specified for collecting or assessing data. Again, some programs were subject to assessment requirements from outside accrediting organizations. Others intended to gather data from small available samples of students completing theses, or from courses with large enrollment and multiple sections. As a result, each program was asked to specify their own assessment process and describe the process when reporting their results. Some programs assessed assignments from all students in an assessed class, and others chose a small number randomly. Most programs used a single assessor to assess each assignment.

**RESULTS**

## Assessment of Graduate Level ILO Diversity Student Work 2021-2022

### Student Performance

The results of the assessment from each graduate program were specified based upon the rubric that they used. Four programs used the university ILO rubric for assessing undergraduate programs, while the remainder developed their own rubrics or used the ones required by their accrediting bodies. The variations in rubric criteria and the number of criteria may exemplify wide variation in the outcomes specified by the graduate programs at CSUEB in terms of Diversity skills or may be the result of discipline-specific terminology and proposed assessment methods in specifying those outcomes.

Table 2. Characterization of Rubrics for Diversity ILO Assessment

College	Program	Rubric	# Criteria	Scale
CBE				
CEAS				
	Counseling – School Counseling concentration	Accrediting Organization	Unknown	Unknown
	Counseling – School Psychology concentration	Accrediting Organization	3	1-4
	Counseling- Marriage and Family Therapy concentration	Accrediting Organization	7	1-100
	Elearning	University	4	1-4
	Educational Leadership (M.S.)	University	4	1-4
	Reading and Literacy	Discipline-specific		
CLASS				
	History	University	4	1-4
	Social Work	Discipline-specific	3	1-100
	Speech Language and Hearing Sciences	University	4	1-4
CSCI				

Given the variation in criteria used for assessment, direct comparison is problematic. That said, all programs have a common goal of measuring various aspects of proficiency in Diversity skills. As such, there appears to be a degree of commonality in the criteria with many programs using at least a number of criteria similar to the university rubric criteria. In the absence of a mapping from discipline-specific criteria to university rubric criteria, which might allow for detailed comparisons on a per-criteria basis, a rough comparison was completed using the following method. Scores were averaged across criteria on a per-program basis, rescaled to a 1-4 scale, and then averaged across all programs in a college, and finally across all programs in the university. One might interpret these numbers as estimates of how programs themselves see the proficiency

levels of their students, where various programs may hold different expectations as to the manner in which proficiency may be demonstrated by their students.

The results of the assessment of Diversity performance for the Diversity ILO on a per-program basis ranged between 3.17 to 4.0 on a 1-4 scale. The interpretation of the ranking values for the university rubric is given below.

Table 3. Average score on all Diversity criteria on scale of 1-4

	<b>University</b>	<b>CBE</b>	<b>CEAS</b>	<b>CLASS</b>	<b>CSCI</b>
<b>Average score</b>	3.56	N/A	3.65	3.47	N/A

**1 – Major Gaps      2 – Some Gaps      3 – Competent      4 – Fully Competent**

Perhaps more useful are some themes that emerged throughout the ILO assessment reports.

- Most programs were satisfied with the diversity skill proficiency of their students across most of the criteria that they assessed.
- While students were assessed to be proficient in diversity skills, they expressed interest in continued work on those skills.
- Again, while proficiency scores were generally high, programs suggested concrete plans for improving them further, many of which were already in the process of being implemented.
- In all cases, programs which identified concerns specified that those concerns could and would be addressed within the programs themselves. This is in contrast to comments made when reviewing results of the Written Communication ILO assessment from 2018-2019 where many programs suggested solutions that would need to be implemented at the University level.
- Several programs experienced difficulties mapping accreditation organization rubrics and results to address the university ILOs.
- COVID concerns are still impacting programs in many ways.

### **Program Feedback Highlights for Diversity**

Highlights of feedback from programs which aligned to the Diversity ILO, taken from their ILO assessment reports, included:

#### **Example Successes**

- “One hundred percent of the assessed students (32) demonstrated evident competency in Cultural Self-Awareness, Knowledge of Diverse Views, Reflection on Interaction with Diverse People and Perspectives, Various Lived Context, Power Structures, Critical Perspectives, and Advocacy, in the four vignette assessment.”
- “Students appeared to improve throughout the semester as evidenced by lower initial grades in testing and overall improvement in final test scoring and improvement in case vignettes.”

- “One specific improvement has been the requirement that all sites must provide opportunities to work with a culturally diverse population of families, couples, and individuals and children.
- “Students by and large found the dynamic of diversity of thought and identity as key points in their research. They are prompted to find something fresh and new and often go down this path.”

**Example Challenges**

- “Students recommended more collaborative work across cohorts for connecting, sharing of knowledge, and supporting one another. A stronger buddy system in which advanced students support more junior students.”
- “-- the exception being those students who went into research with pre-conceived ideas of what they were going to say. The open-ended nature of a research question should be framed in light of this category of the rubric in future sections of the research seminar.”
- “One challenge that we faced during this assessment was that, due to the sensitive nature of some of the conversations in the course, student responses were not recorded and were not available to be analyzed.”
- “There is limited capacity within ..., which is a 2-unit course, to provide multiple in-depth case studies that allow students to practice goal and therapy adaptations.”

**Assessment of Graduate Level ILO Social Justice Student Work 2021-2022**

**Student Performance**

The results of the assessment from each graduate program were specified based upon the rubric that they used. Four programs used the university ILO rubric for assessing undergraduate programs, while the remainder developed their own rubrics or used the ones required by their accrediting bodies. The variations in rubric criteria and the number of criteria may exemplify wide variation in the outcomes specified by the graduate programs at CSUEB in terms of Diversity skills or may be the result of discipline-specific terminology and proposed assessment methods in specifying those outcomes.

Table 2. Characterization of Rubrics for Social Justice ILO Assessment

College	Program	Rubric	# Criteria	Scale
CBE				
CEAS				
	Counseling- Marriage and Family Therapy concentration	Accrediting Organization	7	1-100
	Curriculum and Instruction	Not specified		
	Early Childhood Education	University	4	1-4
	Educational Leadership (M.S.)	University	4	1-4
	Educational Leadership (Ed.D.)	University	4	1-4
	Hospitality, Recreation, and Leisure	University	4	1-4

	Kinesiology	University	4	1-4
	Special Education	Discipline-specific		
CLASS				
	Social Work	Discipline-specific		
CSCI				

Given the variation in criteria used for assessment, direct comparison is problematic. That said, all programs have a common goal of measuring various aspects of proficiency in Social Justice skills. As such, there appears to be a degree of commonality in the criteria with many programs using at least a number of criteria similar to the university rubric criteria. In the absence of a mapping from discipline-specific criteria to university rubric criteria, which might allow for detailed comparisons on a per-criteria basis, a rough comparison was completed using the following method. Scores were averaged across criteria on a per-program basis, rescaled to a 1-4 scale, and then averaged across all programs in a college, and finally across all programs in the university. One might interpret these numbers as estimates of how programs themselves see the proficiency levels of their students, where various programs may hold different expectations as to the manner in which proficiency may be demonstrated by their students.

The results of the assessment of Social Justice performance for the Social Justice ILO on a per-program basis ranged between 2.78 to 3.85 on a 1-4 scale. The interpretation of the ranking values for the university rubric is given below. Only one program from CLASS was aligned to the Social Justice ILO, and so those results have not been shown in the College view for confidentiality reasons.

Table 3. Average score on all Social Justice criteria on scale of 1-4

	University	CBE	CEAS	CLASS	CSCI
<b>Average score</b>	3.55	N/A	3.52	Withheld due to low N	N/A

**1 – Major Gaps      2 – Some Gaps      3 – Competent      4 – Fully Competent**

Perhaps more useful are some themes that emerged throughout the ILO assessment reports.

- Most programs were satisfied with the social justice proficiency of their students across most of the criteria that they assessed.
- Several programs identified one or two criteria in which their students struggled to show proficiency, where the criteria of concern varied with the program. In most cases, the programs suggested concrete plans for addressing the concerns, many of which were already in the process of being implemented.
- In all cases, programs which identified concerns specified that those concerns could and would be addressed within the programs themselves. This is in contrast to comments made when reviewing results of the Written Communication ILO assessment from 2018-2019 where many programs suggested solutions that would need to be implemented at the University level.

- Again, while proficiency scores were generally high, programs suggested concrete plans for improving them further, many of which were already in the process of being implemented.
- Several programs experienced difficulties mapping accreditation organization rubrics and results to address the university ILOs.

### **Program Feedback Highlights for Social Justice**

Highlights of feedback from programs which aligned to the Social Justice ILO, taken from their ILO assessment reports, included:

#### **Example Successes**

- “Students stated that the level of support was excellent and made statements about the flexibility, compassion, and inspirational qualities of the professors.”
- “These findings indicate that they have successfully completed a scholar-practitioner research project on leadership for social justice in educational settings.”
- “we ... added an annual end-of-year review and discussion with student representatives on how to improve our program. We began this feedback gathering, review, and discussion in spring 2022, and began incorporating program improvements in late spring/early summer 2022.”
- “The mean score of student work was at or above the competent rubric score of 3.0 for all four of the criteria; context, power structures, critical perspectives, and advocacy.”

#### **Example Challenges**

- “... students want to begin topic exploration in the first semester of the program and that IRB submission be a clear and “doable” process. Lastly, all cohorts want more interaction with their peers during synchronous session to build community and camaraderie.”
- “Due to the challenges raised by the 2021-22 university IRB process, ..., MS students were unable to complete all the data collection phases as thoroughly as in prior years. As a result, some students modified their empirical research projects to semi-theoretical studies and MS student frustrations were noted in the Spring 2022 DEL Program Survey results.”
- “More emphasis on social justice throughout the curriculum would benefit graduate students. Develop/revise signature assignments related to social justice, so they align with the ILO and PLO learning outcomes, relate to life experiences, and enable students to focus specifically on social justice concepts.”
- “If we continue to use ... for assessing social justice component of our graduate program, we will need to refine the course to highlight different advocacy strategies. I think this can be done by connecting the project directly to how the information they gather will impact their professional practice in socially just ways.”

### **My Story, My Truth Survey**

During 2020-2021, the university conducted a climate survey for students, faculty, and staff summarized in the [Assessment of Climate for Learning, Living, and Working Executive Summary](#).



“The results suggest that students, faculty, and staff generally are comfortable with the overall climate at CSUEB, and in some regards, they hold positive views about their academic and/or work experiences at CSUEB. However, positive experiences and perspectives are not consistent across CSUEB constituent groups. For example, Faculty respondents, Staff respondents, and Student respondents associated with historically underserved social/community/affinity groups (e.g., People of Color, women, low-income students) were less comfortable with the climate at CSUEB.”

*Conclusion, page 25*

On the Office of the President web page, President Sandeen recognized the survey results identified specific areas where the campus could work collaboratively to create a greater sense of belonging.

## **PROCESS CONSIDERATIONS FOR FUTURE GRADUATE PROGRAM ILO ASSESSMENT CYCLES**

In discussions with Educational Effectiveness Committee (EEC) members, and the Dean of Academic Programs and Services, it became clear that it would be advantageous to refine the guidelines for assessment of graduate programs. Some of the issues that could be addressed include:

- Provide a guideline specifying responsibility within a department for ensuring that program annual reports are submitted to CAPR by the due date and ensuring that the reports contain the required ILO assessment results.
- For programs which are accredited by discipline-specific accreditation organizations, a clear mapping of accreditation organization assessment criteria to university ILO criteria should be supplied.
- Since many programs follow PLO assessment plans which do not match the university ILO long-term plan, guidelines for reporting ILO assessment results from years in which assessment was completed should be specified.
- Some programs perform double assessment of student artifacts, once to assess their own PLOs and once to assess the university ILO. This double-assessment should be eliminated to the extent possible.

## **DISCUSSIONS**

### **SUGGESTIONS FOR COLLEGE AND GRADUATE ADVISORY COUNCIL DISCUSSIONS**

#### **Role of ILO Subcommittee**

The ILO Subcommittee will review calibration results and faculty feedback in order to recommend potential changes to the Diversity and Social Justice ILO Rubrics and the ILO Assessment process for undergraduate work. Graduate programs currently using the university rubrics may then decide whether to adopt any proposed changes or move to a discipline-specific rubric.

### **Graduate Advisory Council meetings**

Discussion of ILO assessment results will be placed on the agenda for the Spring 2023 Graduate Advisory Council meeting. Graduate coordinators will be asked to review results and discuss changes made to improve students learning, as well as evaluating the assessment process in order to add meaning to the results and help to improve processes for future assessment cycles.

### **College/Unit Discussions**

Led by associate deans, each college/unit will decide their own approach to reviewing results and conducting discussions generally following the schedules outlined in ILO Long Term Assessment Plan and EEC Communication Plan focused on discussions in Fall of 2022 and implementation in Spring 2023. This includes reviewing those results that add meaning to their discussions about improving student performance in Diversity and Social Justice skills.

### **Support for College and Graduate Advisory Council Discussions**

Please see University Summary Report for contacts and potential meeting format. Possible additional graduate-specific discussion questions include:

1. How do results of graduate assessment compare to undergraduate assessment in departments with both undergraduate and graduate programs? Were results as expected?
2. Were there commonalities between programs in areas of student proficiency or gaps? Can common solutions for addressing gaps be suggested?
3. What is the importance of each criteria within a rubric? Should weights be assigned?
4. Are expectations for proficiency for similar criteria different between programs or colleges? Should they be?
5. Which Diversity and Social Justice interventions are working well, and which are not, for graduate students in particular?
6. What else can be done to improve Diversity and Social Justice skills?