A Report on the
Alignment and Assessment of the CA4 Diversity and Multicultural
Learning Objectives of the
General Education Curriculum

Authored by

David M. Moss* & Helen A. Marx

Contact Information
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Neag School of Education
University of Connecticut
Storrs, CT 06269-2033
david.moss@uconn.edu
860-486-0249

Executive Summary

In the distribution-driven model of the general education curriculum at the University of Connecticut, students select from a wide menu of courses across academic units. Therefore, GEOC needs to demonstrate that individual courses are well aligned with the learning goals of the general education program and that such goals are adequately assessed. By interviewing instructors and evaluating course materials, an assessment team examined the extent to which courses were aligned with the CA4 Diversity and Multiculturalism learning objectives (see Appendix I) as well as the degree to which instructors had developed a means of assessing the objectives.

Overall, findings demonstrate that multiple CA4 learning objectives were sufficiently aligned with each individual course examined, even though courses needed to focus on only one of the seven required Diversity and Multiculturalism learning objectives for approval in this content area. However, the assessment of students' learning of these objectives was rated as less comprehensive in terms of both scope and depth across all courses. Themes from the analysis of the full suite of courses examined for this project suggest that although adequate alignment was seen between the CA4 objectives and course content, the Diversity and Multiculturalism objectives were rarely utilized in the *current* development of each course. Many instructors were assigned to these courses after the initial general education approval process. These instructors were often not made aware of the CA4 learning objectives as they engaged in the instructional design process for their class. Other instructors were aware of the criteria necessary for CA4 approval but did not make use of the learning objectives in their course planning. Instructors expressed more confidence in the alignment of the objectives with their course

content (intended or by chance) than with the assessment of the CA4 objectives, and they reported extensive variability in course content between different sections of approved courses. Instructors described inconsistencies in both scope and depth of the learning objectives and intercultural competencies as they are currently written, and expressed hesitation in utilizing them in the consideration of a redesign of their course.

Beyond any issues regarding the alignment of courses and the CA4 learning objectives, issues underpinning assessment are perhaps of greater concern. Most critical is the lack of explicit attention to formal assessment of the CA4 learning objectives seen across all courses, particularly those that serve large numbers of students. Across most of the courses, specifically with regard the CA4 learning objectives, instructors report that the dominant mode of assessment is via class discussions. Thus, there is significant potential for helping faculty improve their formal assessment strategies of these objectives. Every instructor who was interviewed for this project, without exception, demonstrated deep convictions for notions underpinning diversity and multiculturalism, even if they did not necessarily agree with or adequately assess the CA4 learning objectives in their present form. This important finding suggests there is a meaningful commitment to education in this area at the University of Connecticut.

It is recommended that the CA4 learning objectives be revisited in terms of both scope and depth to ensure a comprehensive, unified, and well articulated set of outcomes be developed to guide the instructional design of individual courses seeking approval in this area. Following this, an extensive student data collection program is warranted. Finally, when evidence of student learning is documented and understood, the re-approval process for the CA4 program area should be considered. Grounded in student

and faculty data, this process should help ensure that all CA4 courses have a workable assessment plan as a major component of their curriculum. Such a process should address any issues of alignment and assessment, which is fundamental to the success of our distribution-model of general education here at the university.

Introduction

The University of Connecticut instituted a revised set of General Education Requirements in 2005, and the General Education Oversight Committee (GEOC) is currently evaluating the extent to which the current program is meeting its stated goals. As part of this effort, GEOC translated the original criteria for inclusion of courses in each content area into learning objectives/outcomes to be met by students (see Appendix I). This report outlines the key findings from an evaluation regarding Content Area 4 (CA4) Diversity and Multiculturalism. This evaluation was designed to determine the extent to which the CA4 learning objectives are aligned with instructor's objectives of selected approved courses, as well as the degree to which the instructors had developed a means of assessing student learning of these objectives.

Framed within the university's commitment to preparing students for life and work within an interconnected, global world and within a culturally pluralistic democracy, the GEOC guidelines (http://geoc.uconn.edu/geocguidelines.htm) define Diversity and Multiculturalism for the General Education curriculum as follows:

> In this interconnected global community, individuals of any profession need to be able to understand, appreciate, and function in cultures other than their own. Diversity and multiculturalism in the university curriculum contribute to this essential aspect of education by bringing to the fore the historical truths about

different cultural and international perspectives, especially those of groups that traditionally have been underrepresented. These groups might be characterized by such features as "race," ethnicity, gender, sexual identities, political systems, religious traditions, or by persons with disabilities. By studying the ideas, histories, values, and creative expressions of diverse groups, students gain appreciation for differences as well as commonalities among people.

The GEOC Diversity and Multiculturalism guidelines also underscore the need for coursework to encompass more than subject matter, stating:

Subject matter alone cannot define multicultural education. A key element is to examine the subject from the perspective of the group that generates the culture. The inquiry needs to be structured by the concepts, ideas, beliefs, and/or values of the culture under study. A variety of approaches can be used, including comparative or interdisciplinary methodologies. Regardless of the approach, courses should view the studied group(s) as authors and agents in the making of history.

The General Education Multicultural and Diversity requirements seek to have students develop a multicultural and global perspective; a perspective that necessitates the interpersonal and intellectual skills necessary to challenge their own culturally embedded assumptions and consider multiple perspectives.

A GEOC subcommittee, consisting of faculty from the relevant departments, converted the goals of the Diversity and Multiculturalism content area criteria into learning objectives which identify what students should be able to know or do upon completing their courses (http://geoc.uconn.edu/Assessment.htm). The CA4 learning objectives are:

Students should be able to carry out, in a reflective manner that is theoretically informed and illustrated with specific examples, with respect to "race," ethnicity,

gender, sexual identity, political system, religious tradition, or of disability, at least one of the following:

1-1. Differentiate varieties of human experiences, thoughts, values, and/or modes of creativity;

2-1. Analyze interpretive systems, political systems, or social structures as cultural/social constructions;

2-2. Explain perspectives on effects of various cultural, social, or political systems on groups of individuals;

3-1. Describe the interrelatedness of various cultures or peoples;

4-1. Contrast definitions of human rights that are derived from at least two different legal, cultural, or values systems;

4-2. Explain the causes and consequences of human migration;

5-1. Discuss social, political, and/or economic power.

Further, the subcommittee states that these learning outcomes should lead students toward the development of intercultural competencies, such as: tolerance for ambiguity, awareness of dissent, empathy, polycentrism, ability to engage with synergies and processes, and the flexibility to challenge one's own structures of thought and behavior (see Appendix I).

At the University of Connecticut, the General Education program includes over 300 approved courses (http://geoc.uconn.edu/CourseListFinal_5-04-09.pdf). Given such a extensive and diverse General Education curriculum, it is essential that we inquire into how well the aims of these courses align with the General Education learning objectives and perhaps even more importantly, to what extent student learning outcomes are assessed within each course. This is especially critical for the Diversity and Multiculturalism content area (CA4), which includes approximately140 of the approved General Education courses.

Methodology

When discussing the contributions of qualitative research, Marshall and Rossman (1998) write, "One purpose of qualitative methods is to discover important questions, processes, and relationships…" (p. 43). Consistent with these notions, this project made use of a qualitative research design to develop a snapshot of the Diversity and Multiculturalism content area of the General Education curriculum. The project was conducted over the course of the 2008-09 academic year. Employing a qualitative case study methodology enabled the research team to inquire into the alignment and assessment of courses approved under the CA4 designation. Drawing upon Creswell's (2007) definition for a case study, our "cases" were defined as approved CA4 courses taught in the spring 2009 semester, and thus delimited by both context and time.

Courses were selected for this project using purposeful selection strategies for establishing a representative sample (Patton, 2002). Sampling criteria allowed for the selection of a variety of courses representative of the CA4 course offerings. Initial sample selection sought courses that represented a range across the following criteria: enrollment size (lecture courses with over 100 students enrolled, lecture courses with discussion sections, and courses with under 50 students enrolled), division (upper or lower), academic affiliation of the course (social sciences, arts, and humanities), domestic and international focus, and courses that meet multiple GEOC content area classifications. Sample selection began with a comprehensive list of Spring 2009 CA4 courses offerings, with the above criteria being used to create a matrix from which twenty-one courses were identified as potential cases. Instructors were contacted in January, 2009 seeking their

willingness and ability to participate in this assessment project, resulting in the selection

of eleven courses.

The following eleven (11) courses were selected and evaluated for this report:

ANTH 1000	Other People's Worlds
CDIS 1150	Introduction to Communication Disorders
ENGL/ AASI 3212	Asian American Literature
ENGL 3318	Literature and Culture in the Third World
HIST/LAMS 3609	Latin America in the National Period
HRTS/POLS 1007	Introduction to Human Rights
MUSI 1002	Sing and Shout! The History of American in Song
PHIL 1106	Non-Western and Comparative Philosophy
POLS/AFAM 3642	African-American Politics
SOCI/AFAM/HRTS 3505	White Racism
SOCI/WS 3621	Sociology of Sexualities

Table 1 summarizes pertinent details for the courses examined in this report, including

criteria used in the purposeful sampling of the courses and additional information

designed to underscore the variability seen within an approved CA4 course.

Table 1 – Spring 2009 Course Details

Course	General Education Classification	Size	Discussion Group/size	Other Sections, Spring 2009 Campus: # sections – size
ANTH 1000	CA4-int; CA2	147	6 sections/ 25 each	Storrs: 2 - 154, 148 HTFD: 3 – 44/44/39 AP: 1 – 36 WTBY: 2 – 34/35
CDIS 1150	CA4; CA2	150	-	-
ENGL 3212	CA4	37	-	-
ENGL 3318	CA4-int	40	-	Storrs; 2 – 39/39
HIST 3609	CA4-int; CA1	44	-	-
HRTS 1007	CA4-int; CA2	87	-	-
MUSI 1002	CA4; CA1	59	3 sections/ 20 each	-
PHIL 1106	CA4-int; CA1	231	8 sections/ 30 each	AP: 1 – 31 WTBY: 2 – 29/29
POLS 3642	CA4	47	-	-
SOCI 3621	CA4	69	-	-
SOCI 3505	CA4	52	-	HTFD: 1 – 15 AP: 1 – 12

Various sources of data were utilized for data collection in this project, including, semi-structured interviews (see Appendix II) and artifacts such as syllabi, exams, assignments, and student work. Once courses were selected and instructors agreed to participate in the project, following several email contacts to establish rapport and outline the scope and timeframe for involvement, individual meetings were established between the researchers and instructors for each course. The primary purpose of the meetings was to conduct the semi-structured (partially open-ended) interviews, to collect artifacts from the class, and to administer the survey (see Appendix III) designed to document to what extent instructors self-reported that their course was aligned with the CA4 learning goals along with the extent to which they believed those objectives were assessed over the course of the semester. All interviews were audio-recorded for further analysis. Follow-up emails and phone contacts were utilized to collect additional course materials as determined necessary for data analysis.

Given that interview questions were open-ended and responses were often extensive and elaborate, we iteratively listened to the audio-recordings and engaged in a data-mapping strategy (Anfara, Brown & Mangione, 2002) to develop specific and clear patterns of response pertaining to each question. For our analysis, we divided responses to questions into "episodic units" (Grant-Davie, 1992, p. 276), identified by their singular focus on a particular idea. For instance, a response to a question asking about modes of assessment might result in the respondent naming "exams," "projects," and "class participation." Each of these was identified as a single episodic unit. Many single responses contained more than one episodic unit. Therefore, parts of a complete answer to any single question might be reduced into different categories, such as formal and

informal assessments. For course artifacts, a similar strategy was employed. All documents were reviewed and coded using the CA4 learning objectives and considered in terms of both alignment and assessment. Interview data and codes from artifacts were collapsed into major themes that we agreed upon following our individual interpretations. Inter-rater reliability was considered by the research team via data collection and analysis of a shared subsample of the data (2 courses). No significant disagreements in data collection or interpretation occurred.

The survey instrument employed during this interview was developed for the purpose of this study. It was modeled after a previous instrument utilized for similar purposes to examine the alignment and assessment of approved courses within the CA3 Science and Technology curriculum. Each survey was administered during the individual meetings between the research team and course instructors. Instructors were asked to respond to statements which indicated their level of alignment and assessment regarding each CA4 learning objective. Additionally, they were asked to identify the extent to which they believed that students in their course developed various intercultural competencies identified within the CA4 learning objectives document, such as tolerance of ambiguity and empathy. Following analysis of the interview and artifacts, the research team indicated their appraisal of the CA4 learning objectives using the survey instrument in terms of both alignment and assessment for each course. Data from the self-report surveys and the researcher ratings were compiled into tables (see tables 2, 3 and 4). Mean scores were calculated for each objective across all eleven courses. These tables provide an overview of the survey results and aided in analysis for this report.

Findings

Overall, findings demonstrate that multiple CA4 learning objectives were sufficiently aligned with each individual course examined; further, even though courses needed to focus on only one of the seven required Diversity and Multiculturalism learning objectives for approval in this content area most courses evaluated were well aligned with a number of the objectives. However, the assessment of students' learning of these objectives was found to be less comprehensive in terms of both scope and depth across all courses.

Course narratives and survey results for individual course are presented in Appendix IV. These narratives provide an overview of each course, highlighting ways the courses align with and assess the CA4 objectives. These narratives also report the self-report survey and researcher ratings for each course. They are included in this report to offer the reader a discussion of course objectives and assessment strategies in terms of the CA4 learning outcomes for each individual course. Table 2 and 3 summarize the alignment and assessment of the CA4 learning objectives with each course as rated by both the instructor and research team, providing an overview of findings. Additionally, Table 4 provides an overview of the self-report survey reporting the extent to which individual course instructors believed that students in their course developed various intercultural competencies. These provide an interesting consideration of the degree to which instructors feel there courses address the intercultural competencies the CA4 subcommittee identified as important, even as these were not specifically included in the learning objectives.

Table 2: Alignment of Course and CA4 Objectives

CA4 Objective	ANTH 1000		CDIS 1150		ENGL 3212		ENGL 3318		HIST 3609		HRTS 1007		MUSI 1002		PHIL 1106		POLS 3642		SOCI 3621		SOCI 3505		Mean Total	
	SRS	*RR*	*SRS*	*RR*	*SRS*	*RR*	*SRS*	*RR*	*SRS*	*RR*	*SRS*	*RR*	*SRS*	*RR*	*SRS*	*RR*	*SRS*	*RR*	*SRS*	*RR*	*SRS*	*RR*	*SRS*	*RR*
1.1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
2.1	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	2	2	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3.63	3.63
2.2	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3.81	3.9
3.1	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	4	4	3.36	3.36
4.1	2	2	3	3	3	2	4	4	2	2	4	4	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	2.9	2.63
4.2	1	1	1	1	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	3	2	2.36	2.18
5.1	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	3.63	3.72

SRS = Self-Report Survey   RR=Research Rating   (1= Not at all; 2 = Barely; 3 = Somewhat; 4= Very well)

Table 3: Assessment of CA4 Objectives

CA4 Objective	ANTH 1000		CDIS 1150		ENGL 3212		ENGL 3318		HIST 3609		HRTS 1007		MUSI 1002		PHIL 1106		POLS 3642		SOCI 3621		SOCI 3505		Mean Total	
	SRS	*RR*	*SRS*	*RR*	*SRS*	*RR*	*SRS*	*RR*	*SRS*	*RR*	*SRS*	*RR*	*SRS*	*RR*	*SRS*	*RR*	*SRS*	*RR*	*SRS*	*RR*	*SRS*	*RR*	*SRS*	*RR*
1.1	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	4	2	3	2	4	4	3	4	4	2	3	4	4	4	3.63	3.36
2.1	4	3	4	3	2	1	4	4	3	2	4	2	2	2	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3.45	3
2.2	4	4	4	3	2	2	4	4	3	2	4	3	4	4	2	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3.54	3.36
3.1	3	3	3	2	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	1	1	3	2	3	2	4	4	3.27	2.63
4.1	2	1	4	4	1	1	3	1	2	1	4	4	3	2	1	1	3	2	2	2	3	3	2.54	2
4.2	1	1	1	1	4	4	4	3	3	2	4	4	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	3	2	2.36	2
5.1	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	4	3.45	3.27

SRS = Self-Report Survey   RR=Research Rating   (1= Not at all; 2 = Barely; 3 = Somewhat; 4= Very well)

Table 4: Applicable Intercultural Competences (as reported on the SRS)

	ANTH 1000	CDIS 1150	ENG 3212	ENGL 3318	HIST 3609	HRTS 1007	MUSI 1002	PHIL 1106	POLS 3642	SOCI 3621	SOCI 3505
Tolerance of Ambiguity	X	X	X	X	X			X		X	X
Awareness of Dissent	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Empathy	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X
Polycentrism	X			X	X			X	X	X	
Ability to engage with synergies and processes	X		X		X		X		X	X	X
Flexibility to challenge own perspectives	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

The following are overarching findings regarding the Diversity and Multiculturalism General Education program derived from the analysis of the suite of eleven (11) courses examined for this project:

- The CA4 learning objectives were rarely utilized in the *current* development of each course. Many instructors were assigned these courses after the initial general education approval process, and were not given the CA4 objectives as they were engaged in the instructional design process for their class.

- Instructors expressed more confidence in the alignment of the objectives with their course content (intended or by chance) than with the assessment of these CA4 objectives.

- Extensive "informal" and undocumented assessments were reported with regard to the respective general education learning objectives.

- Individual instructors were passionate about their subject area and felt challenged to assess the complex and normative topics in their courses.

- There was a variability in course content between different sections of the approved general education courses as reported by instructors.

- Class size was a limiting factor in implementing preferred pedagogical approaches to the course (including assessment) given the complexity of the issues underpinning the learning objectives of the Diversity and Multiculturalism content area.

- Instructors described inconsistencies in both scope and depth of the learning objectives and competencies, and expressed hesitation in utilizing them in the consideration of a redesign of their course.

Implications from these over arching themes suggest that presently the CA4 Diversity and Multiculturalism curriculum is indeed adequately aligned with approved courses; however the lack of use of the CA4 learning objectives in course planning, and the variability among different sections of the same course, may be of concern. The finding that many instructors are teaching CA4 courses without knowledge of the learning objectives and that multiple sections of the same course are reported to be significantly different highlights a potential gap in the CA4 approval and review process. As courses are considered for re-approval, it may be worth determining if courses with multiple sections (sharing the identical course number) are in fact essentially different courses taught under an umbrella designation or in contrast courses which share a common syllabus, text, etc., and are essentially the same course offered multiple times a semester. Also, it may be worth inquiring if courses are regularly "shared" among faculty over a number of semesters, and if various faculty members are facilitating essentially the same course or if they deliver fundamentally different learning experiences. Additionally of concern is the lack of purposeful alignment of the CA4 learning objectives and course content, as the potential for "drift" away from the objectives may be significant as courses naturally evolve over time – even if no variability is seen in between course sections.

Beyond several issues regarding the alignment of course and the CA4 learning objectives, issues underpinning assessment are of even greater concern. Perhaps most critical is the lack of explicit attention of assessment of the CA4 learning objectives seen across all courses. Although many objectives appear to be regularly assessed, there is significant potential for helping faculty improve their assessment strategies, thus ensuring

that the mission of the CA4 program is achieving its greatest potential for impact on student learning. Faculty often described "class discussion" as a primary means of assessment of the CA4 learning objectives, although no methods of documentation of student learning within such discussions was available. This "informal" assessment approach surely has a place in courses and represents a pedagogically sound approach to engaging students during class time; however, such strategies should ideally compliment well documented "formal" assessment strategies including writing prompts, exams, projects and other means which can be directly linked to the CA4 objectives and offer the instructor and student clear formative and summative feedback on advances in learning. Class size was routinely cited as a significant barrier to the implementation of assessment strategies that might document student engagement and learning. Instructors noted that the multifaceted and normative nature of the course material required ongoing formative assessments of student learning as a means to monitor student progress and shape the curriculum accordingly; however faculty noted that the use of such assessment strategies, such as weekly response papers, was to too labor intensive to be practical. Overall, few faculty considered technological solutions for such pedagogical challenges.

Finally, instructors who had not necessarily been familiar with the CA4 learning objectives routinely described inconsistencies in both scope and depth of the learning objectives and competencies, and expressed hesitation in utilizing them in the consideration of a redesign of their course. That is, although they were pleased that they could demonstrate alignment with select elements of the CA4 objectives, they were not certain that in their present form the CA4 learning objectives would be useful in the consideration of curricular revisions, including assessment. For example, one faculty

member noted that Objective 3.1 (Describe the interrelatedness of various cultures or peoples) was so broad in nature in comparison to other objectives that it was "hard to miss." However, this individual went on to explain how such a broad target does not offer much guidance in terms of designing a class and its associated assessments. Another faculty member seriously questioned the current threshold of only having to meet one of the CA4 criteria (which was echoed by other instructors) and commented that a very minor change in almost any UConn course could "make it a Gen Ed course in this area." Although one faculty member summed up his criticism of the CA4 learning objectives by noting that a "clever hypocrite" could teach almost any course under the learning objectives as they stand. It is important to highlight that each and every instructor who was interviewed for this project - without exception - demonstrated a serious and deep commitment to notions underpinning diversity and multiculturalism even if they did not necessarily agree with or explicitly utilize (or adequately assess) the CA4 learning objectives in their current form. This important finding is not to be dismissed lightly, in that it suggests a meaningful and enduring commitment to education in this area at the University of Connecticut.

Next Steps

We recommend the following for consideration as "next steps" to ensure the CA4 Diversity and Multiculturalism general education curriculum reach its potential in impacting student learning across the university. First, we propose that the CA4 learning objectives themselves be revisited in terms of both scope and depth. Many faculty interviewed for this project stated that they would be interested in a conversation about

how changes in the learning objectives could result in a more comprehensive, unified, and well articulated set of outcomes for this program. Such a process could begin with electronically surveying of all faculty teaching in this area regarding key components of such learning objectives, involve focus groups with faculty to refine the aims, and ultimately a task force with the specific charge of revising these learning objectives could be convened to analyze the data (from the faculty survey and focus groups) and propose changes. With adequate planning, such work could likely be completed within a semester.

Once a revised set of CA4 learning objectives (and associated intercultural competencies) are approved by the appropriate governing boards, a faculty "orientation" program should be initiated to aid instructors teaching within this general education area. Such a program may involve two distinct components, with the first designed to foster clear conceptions of the intent of the CA4 learning objectives to address potential alignment issues, and the second designed to encourage faculty to consider explicit formative and summative assessment of these objectives in their course(s). This effort should include relevant technological solutions available (such as Husky CT) to aid faculty in overcoming such obstacles as class size in student assessment. For example, Husky CT may be utilized to help faculty move beyond traditional univocal classroom discourse (e.g. teacher to individual student) and promote ongoing dialectic discourse (e.g. communities of students) to ensure that a plurality of ideas are commonly exchanged throughout the semester and that students are required to participate in such "conversations." This is especially imperative given that most faculty interviewed for this project commented that they rely heavily on only face-to-face classroom discussions as

the primary mode of assessment of the CA4 objectives and that only a small percentage of their students routinely were active contributors to such in class interactions. Such a program could include a brief mandatory component for instructors (making instructional development resources available) accompanied with a menu of optional follow-up individualized professional development opportunities.

Following this intensive professional development effort involving faculty teaching within this general education content area, a comprehensive student data collection project should commence. With the revised CA4 learning objectives in place, and faculty afforded the opportunity to consider alignment and assessment with regard to these new objectives, student data will offer the most compelling evidence regarding the ability of this program to achieve its aims.

In a previous report completed for the CA3 Science and Technology content area, a student "Interest and Self-Efficacy" instrument was developed (Kloeblen and Freake, 2008). Modeled after that process, a similar procedure was initiated in spring 2009 as part of this current effort, however several challenges and difficulties were encountered. Working with Professor Scott Brown of the Department of Educational Psychology, draft items were developed regarding each CA4 learning objective (see Appendix V). Next, the sample items were sent to the faculty participants in this research effort to solicit their feedback on all aspects of the sample items, including conceptual soundness, phrasing of the statement, etc. The feedback from the faculty echoed their earlier sentiments that they were not satisfied with the learning objectives in their present form, and that basing a student survey on them seemed premature. In fact, faculty questioned the notion of a self-efficacy instrument as being the most appropriate way of approaching this effort. Faculty

called for a mixed-method approach using case studies (observations, student interviews and focus groups, etc) along with a large scale instrument designed to collect data on student attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors as a result of taking the CA4 approved course. Although the CA3 survey was designed as post-only assessment, given the multifaceted and normative dimensions of the CA4 curriculum, a more comprehensive approach to student data may be warranted. If adequately funded in upcoming years, The Research Consulting Service in Measurement, Evaluation, and Assessment (MEA) may be available to support GEOC in its efforts. This service is staffed by MEA graduate students under the supervision of MEA faculty in the Neag School of Education, specializes in the design and assessment of survey instruments, development of sampling plans, and the statistical analysis of data.

Finally, when evidence of student learning is documented and understood, a re-approval plan for the CA4 program area should be considered. Grounded in student and faculty data, this redesign should take into account the issues uncovered in this report (turnover in faculty teaching approved courses, variance between sections of a course, etc…) and help ensure that all approved CA4 courses have a workable assessment plan as a major component of their curriculum. Such an approval may also build upon the "faculty orientation" discussed earlier and further address any issues of alignment and assessment which are fundamental to the success of our distribution-model of general education here at the university.

Appendix I

CA4 Assessment Document

Mission
Definition of Diversity and Multiculturalism for General Education
In this interconnected global community, individuals of any profession need to be able to understand, appreciate, and function in cultures other than their own. Diversity and multiculturalism in the university curriculum contribute to this essential aspect of education by bringing to the fore the historical truths about different cultural and international perspectives, especially those of groups that traditionally have been underrepresented. These groups might be characterized by such features as "race," ethnicity, gender, sexual identities, political systems, religious traditions, or by persons with disabilities. By studying the ideas, histories, values, and creative expressions of diverse groups, students gain appreciation for differences as well as commonalities among people.

Subject matter alone cannot define multicultural education. A key element is to examine the subject from the perspective of the group that generates the culture. The inquiry needs to be structured by the concepts, ideas, beliefs, and/or values of the culture under study. A variety of approaches can be used, including comparative or interdisciplinary methodologies. Regardless of the approach, courses should view the studied group(s) as authors and agents in the making of history.

Criteria
Courses may be contemporary or historical in focus; they may be broadly based or highly specialized; they may be at an introductory or advanced level. Courses must contribute to advancing multicultural and/or diverse perspectives and also highlight the perspective of the group(s) under study.

Courses appropriate to this category must meet at least one of the following criteria:

1. Emphasize that there are varieties of human experiences, perceptions, thoughts, values, and/or modes of creativity;
2. Emphasize that interpretive systems and/or social structures are cultural creations;
3. Consider the similarities that may exist among diverse groups;
4. Develop an understanding of and sensitivity to issues involving human rights and migration;
5. Develop an awareness of the dynamics of social, political, and/or economic power in the context of any of the above four items.

At least one course selected by each student must provide an international perspective and/or comparative study of the history of culture(s) over time and place. Courses meeting the international requirement must focus on a group(s) outside of the United States or on cultural continuities and transformations.

Learning Goals
(*Goals* are what the faculty intends students to know after completion of the CA4 requirements)

Students should be aware of and sensitive to different cultural perspectives of groups that traditionally have been underrepresented. They should be able to understand and articulate in some measurable manner, with respect to "race," ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, political system, religious tradition, or of disability, at least one of the following:

1) the varieties of human experiences, perceptions, thoughts, values, and/or modes of creativity
2) interpretive systems and/or social structures as cultural creations
3) the similarities that may exist among diverse groups
4) issues involving human rights and migration
5) the dynamics of social, political, and/or economic power

Moreover, students should be able to be aware of, sensitive to, able to understand and articulate some of the above issues in terms of international or comparative perspectives on the history of culture(s) and on cultural continuities, disruptions, and transformations over time and place.

Outcomes

Learning Objectives
(*Objectives* are assessable and/or demonstrable student achievements and abilities arising from completing CA4 requirements. They are measurable reflections of the content area's learning goals)

Students should be able to carry out, in a reflective manner that is theoretically informed and illustrated with specific examples, with respect to "race," ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, political system, religious tradition, or of disability, at least one of the following:

1-1: Differentiate varieties of human experiences, thoughts, values, and/or modes of creativity;
2-1: Analyze interpretive systems, political systems, or social structures as cultural/social constructions;
2-2: Explain perspectives on effects of various cultural, social, or political systems on groups of individuals;
3-1: Describe the interrelatedness of various cultures or peoples;
4-1: Contrast definitions of human rights that are derived from at least two different legal, cultural, or values systems;
4-2: Explain the causes and consequences of human migration;
5-1: Discuss social, political, and/or economic power.

Moreover, students shall be able to explain, demonstrate, or describe at least one of the above objectives within an international perspective.

Measures

Outcomes in CA4 should be appropriate to the course content and the methods of instruction.

Student work may be sampled for assessment purposes. Assessment in CA4 should be based on students' written reflection or work of equal substance that is assigned as part of the course, and which would include addressing two or more groups or perspectives, with respect to "race," ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, political system, religious tradition or disability, and its application to relevant theory and methods presented in the course.

Results

Students should be aware of and sensitive to different cultural groups and perspectives, with respect to "race," ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, political system, religious tradition or disability, that traditionally have been underrepresented by

- demonstrating that one or more of the learning objectives have become evident in written reflection (or work of equal substance), and that

- such reflection includes the kernel of one or more of the following intercultural competencies: tolerance for ambiguity, awareness of dissent, empathy, polycentrism, ability to engage with synergies and processes, and the flexibility to challenge one's own structures of thought and behavior.

(http://geoc.uconn.edu/Assessment%20Documents/CA4Assessment_11-08.pdf)

Appendix II

Interview Protocol

1. Ask permission to digitally record interview.
2. Explain purpose of interview is to discuss:
   — Alignment of CA4 Learning Objectives to their course objectives;
   — Methods to assess student learning of the CA4 Learning Objectives in their course.
   — Provide instructor with a copy of the CA4 Learning Objectives during interview.
3. History of the course and CA4 classification:
   a. Where you the one who originally sought the CA4 classification for this course?
   b. If so, what was the process like? To what extent did that process influence your teaching of the course? How has the course changed over time? Do you use the CA4 Learning Objectives in your planning for this course?
   c. If not, how did you come to teach this course? What do you know about the CA4 classification for this course? What process have you used to design this course? Do you use the CA4 Learning Objectives in your planning of this course?
4. Discussion of the course content and objectives:
   a. What are the overarching goals for this course? What are your objectives for the course? How is the course organized?
   b. How would you describe the teaching methods/instructional strategies used in this course?
   c. If course includes discussion sections, how do you coordinate these sections? What role do these discussion sections play in your teaching of the course?
   d. Consider each of the CA4 Learning Objectives separately. Is the objective relevant to the goals you have for your course?
   e. How do you teach to the CA4 objectives? What content, instructional strategies, or materials do you use that you feel address these objectives?
   f. Can you give examples of course content and/or student learning within your course related to this objective?
5. Discussion of course assessment strategies:
   a. Describe your assessment scheme for this course.
   b. Considering the CA4 objectives that you feel are aligned with your objectives for your course, how do you assess (informally and formally) student learning of these objectives? Can you give examples of student learning and your assessment of their learning of the objectives in your course?
6. Additional Information:
   a. Is there anything else you want to discuss or show us regarding your course and the ways you address the CA4 objectives in your course?
   b. Ask to collect artifacts:
      i. Syllabus
      ii. Assignment Descriptions
      iii. Quizzes, Exams, Rubrics
      iv. Other pertinent information

Appendix III

Survey Instrument

CA4 Survey: Coverage & Assessment of Learning Objectives

To what extent do you feel you <u>ADDRESS</u> and/or <u>ASSESS</u> the CA4 Learning Objectives in your course? *Please circle the appropriate response:*

1-1. Students differentiate varieties of human experiences, thoughts, values, and/or modes of creativity.

    I <u>ADDRESS</u> this objective in my course:

1	**2**	**3**	**4**
Not at all	Barely	Somewhat	Very well

    I <u>ASSESS</u> this objective in my course:

1	**2**	**3**	**4**
Not at all	Barely	Somewhat	Very well

2-1. Students analyze interpretive systems, political systems, or social structures as cultural/social constructions.

    I <u>ADDRESS</u> this objective in my course:

1	**2**	**3**	**4**
Not at all	Barely	Somewhat	Very well

    I <u>ASSESS</u> this objective in my course:

1	**2**	**3**	**4**
Not at all	Barely	Somewhat	Very well

2-2. Students explain perspectives on effects of various cultural, social, or political systems on groups of individuals.

    I <u>ADDRESS</u> this objective in my course:

1	**2**	**3**	**4**
Not at all	Barely	Somewhat	Very well

    I <u>ASSESS</u> this objective in my course:

1	**2**	**3**	**4**
Not at all	Barely	Somewhat	Very well

3-1. Students describe the interrelatedness of various cultures or peoples.

    I <u>ADDRESS</u> this objective in my course:

1	**2**	**3**	**4**
Not at all	Barely	Somewhat	Very well

    I <u>ASSESS</u> this objective in my course:

1	**2**	**3**	**4**
Not at all	Barely	Somewhat	Very well

4-1. Students contrast definitions of human rights that are derived from at least two different legal, cultural, or values systems.

      I <u>ADDRESS</u> this objective in my course:

1	2	3	4
Not at all	Barely	Somewhat	Very well

      I <u>ASSESS</u> this objective in my course<u>:</u>

1	2	3	4
Not at all	Barely	Somewhat	Very well

4-2. Students explain the causes and consequences of human migration.

      I <u>ADDRESS</u> this objective in my course:

1	2	3	4
Not at all	Barely	Somewhat	Very well

      I <u>ASSESS</u> this objective in my course<u>:</u>

1	2	3	4
Not at all	Barely	Somewhat	Very well

5-1. Students discuss social, political, and/or economic power.

      I <u>ADDRESS</u> this objective in my course:

1	2	3	4
Not at all	Barely	Somewhat	Very well

      I <u>ASSESS</u> this objective in my course<u>:</u>

1	2	3	4
Not at all	Barely	Somewhat	Very well

In the ASSESSMENT of the above Learning Objectives, to what extent do you feel that students in your course begin to develop the following intercultural competencies (please all that apply to your course):

        tolerance of ambiguity
        awareness of dissent
        empathy
        polycentrism
        ability to engage with synergies and processes
        the flexibility to challenge one's own structures of thought and behavior

Appendix IV

Individual Course Narratives*

*Note that course narratives have been omitted from the posted report.

Appendix V

Draft Student Self-Efficacy Instrument

Draft sample items to be utilized in CA4 Student Self-Efficacy Instrument

SD   D   U   A   SA

Objective 1-1. Students differentiate varieties of human experiences, thoughts, values, and/or modes of creativity.

Sample items:

I can discuss differences among human experiences.

I am familiar with issues related to differences in human experiences.

I understand that there are different perspectives on human experiences.

I value the diversity of human experiences.

I can identify three positive attribute of diversity in the human experience.

I believe creativity may be made apparent in different forms.

It is important to value the perspective of others.

I can work effectively with people who think differently than I do.

Objective 2-1. Students analyze interpretive systems, political systems, or social structures as cultural/social constructions.

Sample items:

I can describe political systems as a cultural construct.

I can describe social systems as a cultural construct.

I can describe interpretive systems as a social construct.

Objective 2-2. Students explain perspectives on effects of various cultural, social, or political systems on groups of individuals.

Sample items:

I can explain ways in which a political system may affect an individual or groups of peoples.

I can explain ways in which a social system may affect an individual or groups of peoples.

I can explain ways in which a culture influences individuals or groups of peoples.

Objective 3-1. Students describe the interrelatedness of various cultures or peoples.

Sample items:

I can identify two positive attributes of the interrelatedness of two cultures.

I can identify two issues related to the interrelatedness of two cultures

Objective 4-1. Students contrast definitions of human rights that are derived from at least two different legal, cultural, or values systems.

Sample items:

I can define human rights from a legal perspective.

I can define human rights from a cultural perspective.

I can define human rights from a values system perspective.

I can contrast …

Objective 4-2. Students explain the causes and consequences of human migration.

Sample items:

I can explain the causes of human migration from two different perspectives.

I can identify two causes of human migration.

I can discuss the consequences of human migration from two different perspectives

I can identify two different consequences of human migration.

Objectives 5-1. Students discuss social, political, and/or economic power.

Sample items:

I can discuss social power from two different perspectives.

I can discuss political power from two different perspectives.

I can discuss economic power from two different perspectives.

References

Anfara, V.A., Brown, K.M., & Mangione, T.L. (2002). Qualitative analysis on stage: Making the research process more public. *Educational Researcher, 31* (7), 28-38.

Cresswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Grant-Davie, K. (1992). Coding data: Issues of validity, reliability, and interpretation. In G.   Kirsch & P.A. Sullivan (Eds.), *Methods and methodology in composition research* (pp.   270-286). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Kloeblen, E. & Freake, H. (2008). *Coverage and assessment of Learning Goals in General Education Science and Technology Courses*. Unpublished document of the University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT.

Marshall, C.and G. Rossman (1989). *Designing Qualitative Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Patton, M.Q. (2002). Qualitative *research & evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.