



Office of Student Life & Cultural Centers
**Building a Socially Just Community Through Intergroup Dialogue:
A Pre and Post Assessment**
Assessment Report

Jami Grosser
Senior Coordinator, Cultural Centers

Choose One: Learning Outcome Assessment

Date of Assessment Implementation: Fall 2016

Date of Report: June 2017

Purpose of Assessment

To identify the learning of participants in the fall Intergroup Dialogue (IGD) on Race and Ethnicity

Division Learning Outcome Diversity & Global Consciousness

Targeted Learning Outcome

As a result of participating in Intergroup Dialogue, participants will be able to:

- LO 1 - Observe and analyze experiences of others different from yourself.
- LO 2 - Observe and analyze systems that affect the experiences of others.
- LO 3 - Effectively communicate with people different from yourself.
- LO 4 - Recognize your personal beliefs and values and how they impact others.
- LO 5 - Critically analyze your roles and responsibilities within the University as they relate to diverse groups.

Assessment Methodology

Participants were given a pre-test during the first session of Intergroup Dialogue on week 1, and a post-test on the last day of the dialogue on week 6. The survey was paper and pencil to ensure 100% compliance. The survey was somewhat lengthy with 15 total questions, each with a few sub-questions. Questions were formatted on a 7 or 10-pt Likert Scale to capture the participants' likelihood to engage or feelings on a particular topic. 8 students began the dialogue, and 6 completed the full program. The survey questions were pulled from Gurin, Patricia; Nagda, Biren (Ratnesh); Zuniga, Ximena (2013). *Dialogue Across Difference*. New York, NY: Russel Sage Foundation. The questions have been researched for statistical significance.

Results

6 students completed the survey. All identified as women and woman of color.

LO 1 - Observe and analyze experiences of others different from yourself. (1 = Not at all; 7 = Very much)

- Participants had meaningful and honest discussions outside of the class about race and ethnic relations with people from different racial-ethnic groups more after IGD (pre-4.6 out of 7, post-6.5 out of 7, 27.1% increase).
- Participants were more likely to see issues from many points of views, and to listen to a variety of views after IGD (pre-6.4 out of 7, post-6.7 out of 7 and pre-6.6 out of 7 and post-6.8 out of 7)

- Participants were more likely to feel anger upon learning about injustices that people of different race/ethnicities have experienced after IGD (pre-6.0 out of 7, post-6.5 out of 7)

LO 2 - Observe and analyze systems that affect the experiences of others. (1 = Disagree strongly; 7 = Agree strongly)

- Participants were more likely to agree that prejudice and discrimination in the educational system limit the success of people of color after IGD (pre-4.8 out of 7, post-5.5 out of 7).
- Participants were more likely to agree that unfair hiring and promotion practices help keep many people of color from gaining positions of power after IGD (pre-6.0 out of 7, post-6.2 out of 7).

LO 3 - Effectively communicate with people different from yourself. (1 = Disagree strongly; 7 = Agree strongly)

- Participants were less likely to clam up or freeze when conflict involves strong emotions after IGD (pre-5.0 out of 7, post-4.0 out of 7).
- Participants were more likely to agree that they can help people from different groups deal with conflicts that break out between groups after IGD (pre-3.6 out of 7, post-4.8 out of 7, 17% increase).

LO 4 - Recognize your personal beliefs and values and how they impact others. (1 = Disagree strongly; 7 = Agree strongly)

- Participants were more likely to agree that they have spent time trying to find out more about their racial-ethnic group after IGD (pre-5.8 out of 7, post-6.2 out of 7).
- Participants were more likely to agree that they think a lot about how their racial-ethnic group history and traditions have influenced them after IGD (pre-4.2 out of 7, post-5.5 out of 7, 19% increase).

LO 5 - Critically analyze your roles and responsibilities within the University as they relate to diverse groups. (1 – Never; 7 – Very often)

- Participants showed positive outcomes in 9 different areas when it came to taking actions to address prejudice, discrimination, and injustices, both in confidence in ability to and how often they have engaged in actions. Some examples of these actions include recognize own biases, avoid using stereotypical language, get to know people from diverse backgrounds, and challenge derogatory comments.
- Participants also showed more involvement in campus activities and organizations after IGD, both in groups reflecting their own identities and of others.

Conclusion

Participants showed positive results in all five learning outcomes after completing Intergroup Dialogue. Not all areas surveyed showed positive outcomes, but many did.

Implications for Practice

The six women of color who participated in the fall Intergroup Dialogue showed positive outcomes. There was not a diverse group of students within the dialogue however. The results could be different for a dialogue group made up of different identities. Generally, this dialogue group did not have as much disagreement about topics. They shared similar perspectives. However, the dialogue is accomplishing what we want it to. Participants did learn as a result of the dialogue.

The dialogues need to be increased to reach a greater number of students, as well as to reach out to students from dominant identity groups (e.g. white students and men).

Even though these results are from a small number of participants, they could still be used to help market the program to students in the future, as well as staff and faculty partners.