Campus Council on Assessment and Learning Meeting
Feb 15, 9:15 – 11:15am via Zoom

Present: Alex Musselman (chair), Sarita Shukla, Charity Lovitt, Sara Maxwell, Stoerm Anderson, Kara Adams, Amy Stutesman, Gina Christian, Leslie Hurst, Jose Rodriguez

Welcome and Check in

Approval of January 18 Minutes
- Minutes approved

Discussion Items
- Adams and Rodriguez reported out key takeaways from tri-campus meeting on CEL course designation:
  - Still determining what letter is feasible from registrar side. Considering “E” for engagement.
  - Tri-campus proposed definition still not approved by all 3 campus yet. Waiting on UWT
    - UWB GFO approved of tri-campus definition last year but asked to do another review before it goes final UWS approves of tri-campus definition.
    - High level definition of CEL so that students are clear what they are registering for
    - If this definition ends up changing, may need to rethink rubric to align
  - Discussion around purpose of group, since people rotate in and out
  - Sense of urgency to get the definition finalized after working on it for so long
  - UWT may call for more student feedback. UWB gathered good student feedback last year

Discuss and Approve CEL Course Designation Rubric
Kara Adams, Director, Community Engagement
- Goal is for CCAL to approve rubric and submit to GFO EC for review/approval today
- Changes since previous meeting:
  - Description and examples of criteria separated out.
  - New column added for criteria descriptions
  - Examples added to back

DISCUSSION / FEEDBACK:
- Add note at top explaining that examples are provided
- Make description of application, theory, skill more clear
  - Need to make connection of community-engaged learning to student learning objectives more evident
    - What do we lose by paring down by connecting to student learning objectives?
    - Need to incorporate examples from lower division classes
    - What about when a course obviously has community engaged piece but learning objectives don’t reflect that?
      - If we look at CEL as a method, it will come with its own content that has nothing to do with course learning objectives
      - Potential solution, provide 2 learning objective examples and theory and skills examples
What implication would this have on the description? We just parred it down, this could complicate it.

- In discussion later around CEL ULG rubric, need to look at the ethics of the collaboration and power relationships that may be at play

Summary of suggested changes to Application of Theories and Skills description:
- Update wording to “Connection of community engaged learning to academic and professional theories…”
- Change “Clearly Evident” description to include “theories and skills”
- Change examples, include lower level examples, include 2 learning objectives but also theory and skills examples
- In “Clearly Evident” statement need to state that CEL is articulated as a learning objective OR a method (instead of AND a method)
- Start with “Connect with...” for better readability

Summary of suggested changes to Mutually Beneficial Partnerships description:
- Current description phrased more as a learning goal than a description. Suggest using language from campus community engagement mission statement to address that
- Add language about compensation in examples
- Reframe from passive to active language
- Mutually beneficial partnership doesn’t have to be on syllabus, it is on the form that faculty complete
- Ensure language of all descriptions throughout rubric is consistent
- Contact hours is a “yes” or “no” question and is up to faculty to determine
  - Can be confusing because “academic hours” is an academic term and not just actual engagement with partners
- Faculty struggle in knowing what Mutually Beneficial Partnership looks like so suggest leaving “May look like co-design, co-educate, and co-assess…” language
  - Description already long, will include in those terms in examples
- Mutually beneficial partnerships can happen between student and partner, faculty and partner, institution and partner. Using “course” keeps it broad and doesn’t specify who is in partnership

- Descriptions should provide clarity for what it is we are looking for but these descriptions are vague and not actionable. Need descriptions that are holistic but functional
- Does description hold true across all 5 schools and help the faculty reviewer?

- When students go abroad with COIL program, does that count as CEL?
  - Yes, but hasn’t been thought through completely, courses can have different tags
    - Language “Just and equitable development of region” makes it place-bound, that needs to be corrected

Musselman summarized that Adams will incorporate CCAL feedback and will share back out to council via email for another round of feedback prior to rubric going to EC for review
Review and Discuss CEL ULG Assessment Rubric  
Jose Rodriguez, Assessment and Education Innovation Specialist

Rodriguez expressed that changes agreed to in CEL Course Designation Rubric discussion also impact the CEL ULG assessment rubric and provided the following updates since previous CCAL meeting:

- Updated minimum thresholds to align with CEL Course Designation rubric
- Will make updates to “mutually beneficial partnerships” description based on today’s conversation but it is important that it be defined broadly so schools of flexibility
- CCAL needs to decide if reflection piece will be a separate category in rubric or integrated in rubric in other areas (maybe application)?
  - Are we asking students to be reflective of skill aspect or the application of theory aspect?
    - Council agreed that theories and skills should be kept separate reflections
  - For CEL, Bloom’s Taxonomy does not work well, suggest Marzano’s Taxonomy instead
  - Since this is a minimum threshold, we need to remove “demonstrate execution of” since that is a deeper step
  - We have a good definition of “theory” but not for “skill”.
- Rodriguez will incorporate all feedback and recirculate rubric to CCAL

- Update on DIV ULG assessment process:
  - Currently mapping curriculum for DIV ULG
    - Faculty tasked to send assignments that best reflect DIV ULG
      - Transferring that info into spreadsheet and aligning data
    - Summer 2022
      - Harvest assignments in Canvas (removing identifiers)
      - Coordinate logistics around assessment committee.
      - Begin reaching out to faculty who will be teaching DIV courses in Fall
    - Will begin recruiting faculty for assessment committee in a few weeks. Hope to have committee assembled before summer break
      - Deans know about assessment committee plan
      - Currently finalizing incentives to put in package to present to Deans to ensure everyone is on the same page before unveiling this.
      - Will report more in next CCAL meeting
  - Rodriguez will send out revised rubric to CCAL prior to March meeting

Meeting adjourned

Minutes submitted by Dawn Moncalieri
Meeting adjourned 11:00
The next CCAL meeting is Mar 15, 9:15-11:15am