

**Diversity – Scoring Results & Brief Analysis**

Joan Hawthorne, Director of Assessment & Regional Accreditation

Ryan Zerr, Director of Essential Studies

May 2016

Overview: In February 2016, senior students (n = 97) in ES Capstone courses volunteered to take a specially designed “performance task” that presented them with a scenario touching on diversity issues. The task was designed by UND faculty members to determine the level of accomplishment of UND students relative to the ES Diversity goal. The task was aligned with both UND’s ES diversity criteria and UND’s ES diversity assessment rubric. In May 2016, faculty and academic staff (n = 22) participated in a “scoring session” in which they assessed the students’ work from February 2016. Below are summarized the results from the scoring session.

**Total Score Results from May 2016 Scoring Session** (range 0-30)

0-6 = 20%      7-12 = 30%      13-18 = 35%      19-24 = 12%      25-30 = 3%

**Scores for Individual Criteria on the Diversity Rubric**

Rubric Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Student Scores (Percentage)							Median Sub-Criterion Score
		Beginning	Developing		Conversant		Advanced		
			Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	
Knowledge	Analytical Framework	10	20	25	21	13	9	3	2 <b>Developing</b>
	Cultural Knowledge	12	18	25	23	13	6	2	2 <b>Developing</b>
Cultural Awareness	Self-Reflection	8	12	18	22	17	18	5	3 <b>Conversant</b>
	Cultural Interaction	13	20	25	20	13	6	3	2 <b>Developing</b>
Applications	Critical Thinking	12	15	28	20	14	9	3	2 <b>Developing</b>
	Inter-Cultural Engagement	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Total score results were calculated by adding each student’s sub-criteria scores to obtain a total for each student across all rubric categories. The score distribution indicates that the median total score was 12 out of 30, or 40%. Higher resolution results are summarized in the table above, where scores in each rubric sub-criterion are given. Only in the “Self-Reflection” category was the median score in the Conversant (low) range; the others were all in the Developing (high) range. Relatively few students scored at the Advanced level in any of the criteria. A final note about the above summaries: During the norming phase of the scoring session, scorers decided the performance task did not allow any

judgments to be made for the Inter-Cultural Engagement sub-criterion, and therefore no scores are provided. The applicable rubric criteria definitions are:

**Rubric Criteria Definitions: Advanced Level Descriptors**

**KNOWLEDGE:**

- *Analytical Framework:* Understands and appropriately uses the terms, concepts, and categories necessary for the sophisticated analysis of cultures, worldviews, and issues of diversity.
- *Cultural Knowledge:* Fully understands the complexity of human culture and worldview, particularly in respect to language, history, values, politics, traditions, social norms and structures, beliefs, practices, and other core components of culture.

**CULTURAL AWARENESS:**

- *Self-Reflection:* Demonstrates the ability to recognize and to assess the impact of assumptions, judgments, and/or biases related to one's own and other cultures.
- *Cultural Interaction:* Initiates, engages, develops, and values interactions with all cultures.

**APPLICATIONS:**

- *Critical Thinking:* Applies appropriate analytical terms, cultural knowledge, and a valid cultural perspective to a sustained, detailed analysis of an issue or problem related to human diversity, cultural difference, or cultural understanding.
- *Inter-Cultural Engagement:* Applies cultural knowledge and awareness to engage positively with other cultures; when working with others, successfully incorporates multiple perspectives to achieve a shared understanding.

**Diversity Performance Task**

*Designed for Essential Studies by UND faculty: Justin Berg (Sociology), Brian Darby (Biology), Melissa Gjellstad (Languages), Jan Goodwin (Nutrition & Dietetics), Birgit Hans (American Indian Studies), Joan Hawthorne (Assessment & Regional Accreditation), Sukhvarsh Jerath (Civil Engineering), Sandra Mitchell (Diversity & Inclusion), and Lori Robison (English).*

**Task summary:** Prior to Halloween, the UND administration urges students to be thoughtful about the impact their costume choice may have on others. To help students correctly interpret this request, Student Government solicits open letters from UND students asking them to speak to their fellow students about the issue: How should costume choices be made? Where is the fine line between freedom of expression and inclusiveness, respect, and sensitivity? What does it mean to make a respectful costume choice?

**Student's role:** To write such an open letter to fellow UND students, utilizing the provided source documents as well as personal knowledge and experiences. Also, separate from the letter, write an explanation of it, clarifying to Senators (who will decide which letters should be part of the collection) why the letter was written in the manner that it was.

**Document library:**

- Demographic information (gender, race, sexual identity, age, stress level, and prevalence of mental illness among UND students and the US generally).
- Advertising depictions of Halloween costumes.
- Blog posts from students elsewhere that speak to the issue.

### **Summary Notes from Campus Debriefing**

(Scorers' thoughts from discussions immediately following the scoring session.)

1. There was some discussion about whether the task, by its nature, could even allow for papers with scores in the Advanced level. Students were explicitly asked to write to their peers, and thus to adopt a non-academic writing style.
2. An overall impression is that the work was subpar and not terribly encouraging.
  - a. Strengths: Students seemed to do best in the Self-Reflection criterion, seeming to be aware of the message that cultural sensitivity is an issue. That students are receiving that message is good.
  - b. Weaknesses: Student responses generally lacked substance, they were too personalized and thus lacked a sense of broader social patterns. Also, few of the work products referenced the document library materials, except perhaps the most easily referenced part – the statistics. Finally, theory was a weak point for students, as compared to their relative strength on the reflective component.
3. Generally there seemed to be a lack of student self-awareness.
4. What does UND need to do more of to lead to a better outcome?
  - a. Students need to learn how to use the language associated with the diversity learning goal more appropriately.
  - b. They need more awareness of societal issues and how they impact diversity issues.
  - c. They need to be immersed in situations that push them out of their comfort zone. Similarly, they need more experience discussing difficult issues.
  - d. Are two diversity courses enough? Perhaps we need more, or perhaps a more “concentrated” one – such as from the ES Core proposal?
  - e. Expectations for ES diversity courses include attention to theoretical considerations. Generally students weren't use this type of knowledge to complete the task. Perhaps more needs to be done to ensure students are getting rigor from their ES diversity courses.
  - f. UND's curriculum is lacking in experiential learning, which could help expose students to the types of issues that would help their understanding in this area.
5. How, if at all, will this scoring session experience change the way you teach a diversity class?
  - a. More effort at inserting diversity education into STEM courses.
  - b. More interdisciplinary work – help students to break out of the silo mentality that is enforced through the current single-discipline course structure.
  - c. We need more proactive conversations about diversity.
  - d. The academic lessons of our courses need to be brought more into the “here and now.”
6. Overall the rubric seemed to work well.
7. Each of the 97 student work products was scored by at least two scorers. If total scores differed by more than 5 points (out of 30 total possible points), a third scorer was utilized.
  - a. 53% required a third scoring (51/97)
  - b. 14% (14/97) had both scorers differ by 0 or 1 total points
  - c. These two statistics together suggest a rubric that is well-matched to the task, that was easy to apply consistently, and/or a pre-scoring norming session that was effective at helping scorers properly apply the rubric.