**2016 DIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING OUTCOME ASSESSMENT**

**INTERIM REPORT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

In the spring of 2016, Westmont College conducted assessment of student learning in relation to the Diversity ILO that reads, *Westmont graduates* will be able to analyze topics and human experiences using categories such as race, ethnicity, gender, social status and disability. The primary goal was to learn how well our students were meeting the relevant institutional outcome. The project was coordinated by Dr. Dinora Cardoso, Professor and Chair of Modern Languages, Lead Assessment Specialist for Diversity, Jason Cha, Director of Intercultural Programs and Associate Lead Assessment Specialist, and Dr. Tatiana Nazarenko, Dean of Curriculum and Educational Effectiveness.

**DESIGN AND METHODS**

***Indirect Assessment***

In the spring of 2016, Joseph Briones, a Westmont senior from the Department of Kinesiology, conducted the Student Diverse Learning Environmental Survey (SDLES) as his Honors project. He collected Westmont students’ responses (n=350) to five major and three additional diversity-related questions and compared the 2016 results to the results of a similar survey administered in 2011. The 2016 SDLES results demonstrate that overall student awareness about issues pertaining to race/ethnicity, inclusiveness, equality and equity has increased.  As a result, current students are more introspective about current diversity programming, as well as, more eager to learn about diversity and more prepared to interact with individuals or groups unlike themselves. According to Briones’s data analysis

* 87% of students (85% of students of color and 88% of white students) felt a sense of belonging to Westmont campus. In 2011, this percentage was slightly higher *–* 90%.
* 43% of students in 2016 disagreed that Westmont has a long standing commitment to diversity as compared to 22% in 2011. Interestingly, in 2016, both students of color (45%) and white students (43%) had similar perspectives regarding Westmont’s commitment to diversity.
* 23% of students in 2016 (35 % of students of color and 17% of white student) disagreed that Westmont promotes the appreciation of cultural differences as compared to 10% in 2011. Remarkably, students of color had very different perspectives than white students on how the college is promoting the appreciation of cultural differences.
* 38% of students (50% of students of color and 32% of white students) in 2016 agreed that Westmont has a lot of racial tension as compared to 7% of in 2011. Again, students of color had very different perspectives than white students on the existence of racial tension.
* 78% of students in 2016 expressed dissatisfaction with the racial/ethnic diversity of student body/enrollment as compared to 66% in 2011.
* 71% of students in 2016 indicated dissatisfaction with the racial/ethnic diversity of the faculty as compared to 48% in 2011.
* 65% of students in 2016 expressed dissatisfaction with the racial/ethnic diversity of staff members as compared to 47% in 2011.
* 64 % of students in 20166 were dissatisfied with the interactions among different racial / ethnic groups at Westmont as compared to 44% in 2011.

We interpret this dissatisfaction as a result of students’ growing awareness of diversity issues and feel encouraged that campus culture is moving in the right direction (See Appendix A for details).

Our indirect assessment continues in 2016-17, we administered a version of the sent Diverse Learning Environmental Survey to faculty and staff in the fall of 2016. We hope to compare the results with the student responses, which should help us to target areas of common concern between the two groups. By identifying common concerns, we can deploy resources where both students and faculty/staff will receive the greatest benefit.

***Direct Assessment***

In 2014-15, Pepperdine University, University of San Diego and Westmont College collaborated on developing a signature assignment and rubric for assessing student learning in relation to diversity and, also, piloted a diversity project on their campuses. The rubric was developed from several of the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) VALUE [rubrics.](https://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics) The readings on various aspects of racial, socio-economic and religious differences were paired with questions designed to guide students’ responses. The tool was piloted by all three institutions.

The following year, 2015-16, Westmont College assembled a diverse committee from across the college; various constituents from Student Life, Library, and faculty spearheaded the diversity assessment. Taking a cue from the work done in 2014-15, the committee adapted the rubric from the preliminary study, which included categories that were rated on a four-point scale. For the modified version of the Diversity Signature Assignment (DSA), the Diversity Assessment Committee chose a similar reading that focused strictly on race, namely the November 2015 *Miami Herald* article entitled “Shoppers fighting back against ‘shopping while black’ profiling with social media, lawsuits” by Lisa Gutierrez. Students were asked to write short essay responses to six questions, which were also adapted from the work done in 2014-15. The DSA was titled “Diversity Reflection.”

One of the preliminary issues facing the committee was the multiple diversity categories included in the ILO. Due to our relatively small student body, the committee decided to focus on race in doing the assessment rather than splintering the sample size to address each of the other categories (ethnicity, gender, social status, and disability). All senior seminars and senior-level courses were invited to participate in delivering the assessment. In exchange, we offered to provide participating departments with student data for their Program Review. However, many disciplines declined to participate and responded that their course content or major did not lend itself to the diversity assessment.

The assessment assignment consisted of an instruction sheet, the reading or case study, and the prompt questions. In order to have a meaningful sample, the faculty involved were asked to include the reading and questions in their syllabi and give some sort of credit. Some assignments counted as homework while others were included as extra credit. The students accessed the assignment and submitted their responses through LiveText. Writing samples were collected in Spring 2016. The following courses added the assessment to their syllabi: ART-195, KNS 195 (2 sections), EB-195, PHI-195, PHY-195, PSY 198, RS-180, SOC-195 and TA-140.

Once the student responses were collected, raters had to be recruited and trained. A team, consisting of original members of the diversity assessment committee and other volunteers from across campus, rated the writing samples. Again, this group included faculty and staff. First, the evaluators were trained by calibrating their work. Sample responses were rated and discussed. Raters were separated into small groups and rated a few student responses, which were later discussed by the entire group. Finally, two assessors were assigned to read each student’s response. After the DSA was scored, the entire team gathered again to report general impressions and discuss the results. The group offered suggestions for closing the loop.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

A total of 82 students participated in the diversity assessment. The student responses were double rated; therefore, we have data for 164 assessments, including works of 55 (67%) seniors, 18 (22%) juniors, 8 (10%) sophomores. Participating seniors constitute 18% of the graduating class of 305 seniors. Participating seniors’ average GPA was 3.3062, which is slightly higher than all seniors’ average GPA of 3.2769. Forty-four students (54%) identified as female, and 38 (46%) were males. Sixty-two students (76%) identified as white. Twenty students (24%) identified as one of the following ethnicities: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, or declined to answer. The sample group was 11% more diverse than the general population of Westmont students (Figures 1-3).

*Figure 1*: *Westmont Diversity Signature Assignment results (2016): the entire sample*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Self-Awareness (Cultural)... |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif26 (15%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif42 (25%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif58 (35%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif38 (23%) |

 |
| Cultural Diversity (Cultural Worldview Frameworks, Curiosity, and Openness... |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif19 (11%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif45 (27%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif65 (39%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif35 (21%) |

 |
| Empathy (Perspective Taking)... |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif16 (9%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif59 (35%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif49 (29%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif40 (24%) |

 |
| Social Responsibility (Communication)... |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif13 (7%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif31 (18%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif79 (48%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif41 (25%) |

 |
| Understanding Systems... |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif18 (10%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif40 (24%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif44 (26%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif62 (37%) |

 |
| Faith... |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif10 (6%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif30 (18%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif79 (48%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif43 (26%) |

 |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | Highly Developed |   | Developed |   | Emerging |   | Initial |

 |

The overall assessment results were quite alarming. In each of the categories of the rubric, (#1 *–* 58%, #2 *–* 60%, #3 *–* 53%, #4 *–* 73%, #5 *–* 53%, #6 *–* 74%) the majority of the students were not at the “developed” or “highly developed” stage in their knowledge of diversity. Between 21% and 37%, depending on the rubric category, were at the initial stage of development.

Overall, Westmont seniors did not demonstrate better results than their under-classmates. In fact, Westmont sophomores outperformed seniors (*Figures 5 and 6*).

*Figure2*: *Westmont Diversity Signature Assignment results (2016): seniors*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Self-Awareness (Cultural)... |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif19 (17%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif27 (24%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif39 (35%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif25 (22%) |

 |
| Cultural Diversity (Cultural Worldview Frameworks, Curiosity, and Openness... |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif14 (12%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif28 (25%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif45 (40%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif23 (20%) |

 |
| Empathy (Perspective Taking)... |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif10 (9%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif40 (36%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif31 (28%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif29 (26%) |

 |
| Social Responsibility (Communication)... |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif6 (5%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif20 (18%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif54 (49%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif30 (27%) |

 |
| Understanding Systems... |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif13 (11%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif28 (25%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif28 (25%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif41 (37%) |

 |
| Faith... |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif6 (5%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif22 (20%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif50 (46%) | https://www.livetext.com/assets/clear.gif30 (27%) |

 |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | Highly Developed |   | Developed |   | Emerging |   | Initial |

 |

**KEY FINDINGS**

* Students were scored on a four-point rubric. In each dimension of the rubric, the majority of the students were not at the “developed” or “highly developed” stage in their knowledge of diversity, which is lower than expected of most Westmont undergraduates.
* Westmont College and Pepperdine University participated in the case-study component of this study. Average scores from Westmont and Pepperdine were essentially the same, helping to legitimize the tools and scoring used in the project.
* Between 21% and 37% of students, depending on the rubric category, were at the initial stage of development, which represents a very basic understanding of the concepts. The percentage of students, who scored at such low levels, should be examined by the College.
* Westmont students scored highest in the dimensions related to empathy, and understanding and applying principles of cultural diversity. The lowest scores came in the areas related to social responsibility and faith.
* Overall, Westmont seniors did not demonstrate better results than their under-classmates. In fact, Westmont sophomores outperformed seniors.
* Ethnic minority students demonstrated better results than white students; female students outperformed male students.

**LINES OF INQUIRY**

The following questions came from discussions with the assessment team and various individuals around campus. They are not meant to be prescriptive of the conversations for our campus, but rather as suggestions on which we hope the entire community will feel engaged to contribute. We welcome more questions to add to the list and any thoughts for the community to consider.

1. Considering the current social climate, is diversity an urgent, necessary component to a Christian Liberal Arts education? Is there any profession where students will not have to engage with the diversity of our society? Will not all students have to engage a diverse population within their social circles, particularly their churches? How do Westmont students become competent to address and respond to diversity in society? The current “hit and miss” approach (no requirement, some courses address the topic specifically), where some students become very competent due to varying experiences throughout the curriculum, leaves a sizeable segment of the graduates in very precarious stages of development.
	1. Is Westmont’s “Biblical and Theological Foundation of Diversity” a document that is central to our mission? If so, how many faculty and courses implement it in their teaching and curriculum?
	2. Given the social demand for understanding diverse groups and our global mission, how important is the diversity ILO for each Program? In each Program, which courses address diversity? Where do students learn the vocabulary, recognize inequalities, plan and effect change? Should students be introduced to diversity early during their Westmont tenure? If so, should first-year seminars be a forum for discussion related to diversity? Should GE have a diversity component? How would an additional requirement impact the GE curriculum? Should diversity be addressed within each major? Should Chapel be a forum to educate students on diversity?
	3. Would more community based learning be helpful in preparing our students to live in an increasingly diverse world? Assessors suggested that community service programs (transition house) might intersect with diversity learning. What role, if any, do other HIPs (High Impact Practices) have in addressing diversity?
	4. Are we committed to candid dialogues about diversity and the Westmont climate for students, staff, and faculty?
2. Did students’ limited exposure to learning about diversity in our classrooms and beyond prevent them from forming a more sophisticated opinion about diversity and racism? Or was this merely a reflection of a hurried compliance to write an assignment? How do we ensure student responses on the written exam reflect their ability to function within a diverse environment? How do we motivate them to respond fully? (This issue becomes important when there are no clear courses in which the ILO is addressed.)
3. How do we assure participation in the ILO assessment from senior seminars? With a growing demand to test first-years and seniors as a way to measure “growth” in a particular ILO, how do we keep assessment manageable for faculty who may be doing GE, Program, and Institutional assessment projects in the same semester?
4. Do we know who our students are? Do we fully understand their needs for learning about diversity?
5. If our current system is “good enough,” how do we improve the on-campus experience for students whose majors are not accomplishing the development necessary to interact with the growing diversity in our society? Would a sustained coordination to change campus culture produce better results?
	1. Diverse staff, faculty and student recruitment and retention must focus on providing a different campus culture. We may not be able to afford an attitude of “hospitality,” which comes from a position of privilege (Hernandez, 2012). From this position, we welcome the stranger, who must comply with our culture, while the host has all the power and decides how and when to make change, what resources to give to change, who will implement change, etc. Instead we have to understand our global family, which we should not treat as guests, but as full members of the clan. “Different” describes each of us in our own way. “Different” should not be perceived as “strange,” but rather a challenge to understand. Are we ready for this challenge? Are we ready to create a new culture that is large and inclusive enough for the “other” to become “us”?
	2. Where do faculty learn the necessary tools for facilitating discussions on diversity? Diversity seems to be out of the comfort zone and area of expertise for many faculty members, as it is not directly related to content of their disciplines. Do we recognize that embracing diversity means valuing diverse experiences, ways and practices of teaching, conducting research, doing business or serving the community? Do we truly accept and support these diverse ways? Do we know how to show acceptance, appreciation, and support for diverse experiences and practices? Assessors noted that faculty development opportunities are needed.
		1. Perhaps faculty might attend the [ACC&U Diversity conference](https://www.aacu.org/meetings/dlss/2017) or [SEED Diversity program](http://nationalseedproject.org/) or the college might bring in a consultant (Dr. [J. Goosby Smith](https://www.linkedin.com/in/drjgoosbysmith) was suggested by Chapman University; [Culture Matters training offered by Cultural Intelligence Centre](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Ctnazarenko%5CAppData%5CLocal%5CTraining%5CWestmont%20College%20Culture%20Matters%20Training%20Proposal%20August%202016.pdf) might be considered as well).
		2. This past May, a group of us participated in the Immigration Immersion Seminar for faculty; a very moving and revealing experience about the human condition. Would other faculty be willing to experience the “other” up close and personal? Our guess is that they would under the right circumstances.
		3. The assessment team was concerned that faculty professional development on diversity may not be self-selected. What incentives can we offer faculty who do not think that they need to participate in Diversity training?
6. What exactly do we want students to know or do? Is the articulation of problems enough? Do we expect students to express empathy? Would we like a sense of social justice? Are we expecting more than articulation of social justice?
7. Assessors discussed the idea of hiring a chief diversity officer noting that other schools have such a position. There was discussion that such a position should not be folded into the Director of Global Education position. The suggestion was made to have a Diversity officer/faculty with a 50/50 load. Social Sciences or Humanities could absorb the 50% load with the expertise on diversity.

**CLOSING THE LOOP**

To be addressed after this year’s indirect assessment and consultation with the faculty and the Diversity Committee.