Campus Council on Assessment and Learning Meeting
Jan 18, 9:15 – 11:15am via Zoom

Present: Alex Musselman (chair), Adrian Sinkler, Sara Maxwell, Leslie Hurst, Jose Rodriguez, Daniel Nyachuba, Braxton Goss, Kara Adams, Gina Christian, Charity Lovitt, Stoerm Anderson

Welcome and Check in

Approval of November 4 and December 2 Minutes
- Minutes approved

Discussion Items
- Diversity ULG Update
  Jose Rodriguez, Assessment & Education Innovation Specialist
  - All planned faculty and stake holder meetings completed
  - Language for sampling student work was discussed and is in process
  - Will now begin curriculum mapping
  - Will ask “What particular program learning goals does this assignment tap into?”
  - Will finalize rubric for Community Engaged Learning ULG
    - Don’t want to develop 2 rubrics if we don’t have to so will work with Adams (already developing rubric for CEL designation) to see where to combine efforts and align work
  - What can CCAL do to support?
    - Provide feedback as to whether it is advisable to use the draft rubric already created for CEL designation as a starting point for CEL ULG assessment rubric
      - Yes, makes sense to translate that into what processes we establish
      - Establishing same processes as were used for Diversity ULG assessment could be easier
    - Rodriguez will provide updated rubric for CCAL review
  - Ahead of schedule in assessment of CEL ULG thanks to the work already done by Kara Adam’s team the sense that a lot of work has already been done by Kara Adams team
  - Definitely in Phase 2 now and will keep moving forward

- Community Engaged Learning (CEL) Work
  Kara Adams, Director, CBLR
  - Shared draft rubric to be used by CCASC to determine if faculty-proposed courses for CEL course tag meet standards to be granted that tag
  - Can be strong alignment between this rubric and a rubric to assess CEL ULG
  - Previous feedback on rubric suggested adding examples (some concrete some more descriptive) for each of the criteria. Does CCAL agree that adding an example column makes sense? Could it be simplified?
DISCUSSION:

- Faculty will need to provide a percentage of contact hours for course related to CEL and a description. Will not need to provide examples.
- May want to clarify what “reciprocal partnership” means. Rubric needs to help reviewers understand language of CEL.
- Suggest having definition column on the front and provide examples on back.
- Carnegie will not ask for specific data about contact hours when they return for 2025 review but it is a broader research question that is being considered.
- Contact hour information is definition is helpful for faculty but not applicable to student learning goals.

- Adams will make edits and distribute for review/approve in next CCAL meeting.
- How do we align the CEL learning outcomes assessment rubric to the CEL designation rubric? And how do we align it to the DIV ULG rubric created last year?
  - Contact hours do not need to be part of student outcomes rubric.
  - CEL learning outcomes rubric needs to be similar to the DIV rubric in that it either applies, doesn’t apply, or is not applicable. Not all aspects of the rubric have to align with a particular assignment. Want to be flexible.
- Criteria in the CEL designation rubric, with the exception of the contact hours, do a good job of providing an umbrella of what we would expect assignments to tap in to. If CCAL has any further feedback or questions on that should be forwarded to Jose.
- CEL is both a method of reaching a learning goal and a learning goal itself so it is a complicated.
  - When we translate these into measurable items, it will get complicated.
- Is there anything that isn’t present in the CEL designation criteria that you would expect to see when looking at CEL student learning outcomes?
  - Reflective learning is not articulated clearly in the CEL ULG.
    - Reflective learning should be included when looking at application of theory and skill.
      - Do theory and skill need to be assessed separately? Or together?
        - Could see advantage of those being separated in a student learning rubric as they are not always entwined.
      - Which theories and skills are we looking for specifically for each learning goal?
        - Theories and skills relevant to the discipline the student is learning.
        - Keep rubric more generic, less discipline-specific
          - Need to indicate which ones are specific to CEL though.
- CEL can be used solely as a pedagogical method, solely as a learning outcome, or a combination of the two.
  - Because there are so many “flavors” of CEL, difficult to create just one rubric.
  - “Reflective Learning” isn’t included in UWB CEL ULG but it is being considered to be part of tri-campus CEL definition.
    - May have been excluded from UWB ULG because there are so many variations on what “reflection” means and many faculty aren’t trained in how to do it. Strong case for including it back in and providing examples for faculty.
    - Can include reflective learning in student outcomes rubric.
Neither the course designation rubric nor the learning outcomes rubrics are finite, they can inform each other.

We are currently working to see to what extent assessment practices align with ULG. Don't need to go too deep in the weeds of those learning outcomes. Those are details that would be looked at at the unit level, rather than for a campus-wide rubric.

- As with the Diversity ULG rubric, need to come to agreement to what the minimum thresholds are (did students meet or not or it was not applicable), keep it simple and useable across disciplines.
- Since there will be much variation, should consider a “visual scaling” method which allows you to role things up to a common standard.

As with the Diversity ULG rubric, CCAL should work to specify the levels of Bloom’s taxonomy.

- For Diversity ULG, there was a lot of conversation around multi-culturalism vs. critical perspectives and whether or not to include higher level Bloom’s taxonomy.
- CEL falls into upper level of Bloom’s taxonomy but Bloom’s is meant to be applied to content, not necessarily skill so may want to consider skill-based taxonomy since CEL is more of a skill rather than just content.

During Carnegie designation process, a student rubric was started (to map to ULGs, at more of a micro level), Adams will find that draft document and share with Rodriguez.

Musselman called for an informal vote as to whether, in moving forward with developing the CEL student outcomes rubric, it makes sense to build upon the CEL course designation rubric. The council agreed that building on the course designation rubric makes sense.

**Action Items:**

- Rodriguez circulate draft CEL learning outcomes rubric to CCAL week prior to Feb CCAL meeting
- Adams incorporate CCAL feedback into CEL course designation rubric, circulate to CCAL with goal of voting on rubric in Feb CCAL meeting
- Musselman reach out to GFO EC, request time on a future agenda for CEL course designation rubric review/vote

**Meeting Adjourned**

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