

Campus Council on Assessment and Learning Meeting
Mar 3, 2021, 11:30am-1:30pm via Zoom

Present: Alex Musselman (chair), Andrea Anthony, Sarita Shukla, Charity Lovitt, Kristin Gustafson, Stoerm Anderson, Leslie Hurst, Karen Rosenberg, Adrian Sinkler, Daniel Nyachuba, Pen Moon, Kara Adams, Natalia Dyba, Terry Hill

Welcome and Check-in

Approval of Minutes: Feb 3 minutes approved

Discussion Items:

Assessment of Diversity ULG Progress Update

Natalia Dyba

- Deadline for ULG assessment inventories from schools was Mar 1 – waiting on Education & NHS
- Google folder has been created for sharing inventory materials
- Questions for CCAL to consider:
 - To what extent should we be considering Learning Objectives and metrics that imply an “understanding of diversity” (e.g. “collaboration with diverse others?”)
 - “collaboration” is an activity rather than an understanding. “Were you able to work with others?” different from having an understanding of “others” backgrounds
 - Multiculturalism vs. social justice framework?
 - What aspects would be most helpful in an organizing framework for information compiled from schools/units? Several possible frameworks to consider:
 - Group information into 5 “buckets” of learning objectives created during 2014 assessment working group
 - Critical Perspectives outlined by working group as being addressed by the Diversity ULG. 5 learning objectives have these critical perspectives mapped on to them.
 - DIV course designation criteria
 - Bloom’s taxonomy
 - Or something different that CCAL may prefer

Discussion:

- Critical perspective framework might be too advanced
- DIV framework helpful if data is already being collected
 - Currently no process of assessing DIV courses
 - Caution against conflating that DIV course equates to DIV ULG being met
 - Framing as analyze of what’s currently happening in DIV courses good start
 - DIV designation sets bar higher than existing ULG, might not be best framework
- Could start with critical perspectives framework initially
 - Critical Perspectives used in 2013/14 ULG assessment work
 - Advantageous to use something internal that has already been approved in assessment. May have more weight to faculty than an outside perspective.
- Both Diversity ULG LOs and Critical Perspectives were used in 2013/14 work.

2020-21 CCAL Membership:
Alex Musselman (Chair) – STEM rep
Andrea Anthony – Business rep
Sarita Shukla – Education rep
Charity Lovitt – FYPP rep
Kristin Gustafson – IAS rep
Stoerm Anderson – NHS rep
Kara Adams – CBLR ex-officio
Penelope Moon – DLE ex-officio
Terry Hill - Student Affairs ex-officio
Leslie Hurst – T&L/Library ex-officio
Karen Rosenberg – WCC ex-officio
Daniel Nyachuba – IR ex-officio
Adrian Sinkler – IR ex-officio
Natalia Dyba – Connected Learning
Keita Shimizu - ASUWB

- Caution against using course-level performance as an institutional metric.
 - Only IAS doing assessment beyond course level so no mapping has been done across courses.
- Dyba hasn't found any end of course assessments that include details and examples. How deeply does CCAL want to dig? Meet with professors and ask for examples of assignments and exams?
 - Curricular assessment might be helpful but not sufficient
 - There are things very specific to fields that may need to be considered
 - Mapping course-level assessment to ULG should be happening at school level
 - Needs to be implementable
 - Work has to be scaffold at course level and feed into institutional levels
 - Seeing opportunities for commonalities across schools could be a good place to start to find some common assessment metrics for ULGs
 - How schools demonstrate those commonalities through their curriculum might differ greatly
 - Level of coordination across units will be a tremendous amount of work
 - A lot of curricular work and hard to do ex post facto
 - Difficult to get everybody doing similar work across institution
- What can be done between now and the hiring of an assessment coordinator to set them up to do deeper analysis later?
 - Using DIV designation framework, we can ask "Are we addressing diversity goal or not in these DIV courses?" If not, what are the differences between those doing well and those that are not?
 - Problem is expectations in DIV course differ from expectations of ULGs.
 - For broad student outcomes, using courses as main level for assessing is not best practice. CCAL should focus on setting infrastructure and allow faculty to decide whether to go deep or shallow in assessment, depending on program.
- How to move the work forward?
 - Could take metrics provided by schools and map them on to frameworks used in 2014 assessment work. Might look different for each unit and be challenging.
 - Critical perspectives framework makes more sense for that reason.
 - Considering asking students "Are you aware of the ULGs?", that means they are aware of not only how they work with each other but how their work impacts others. Then we at least know if students are aware of DIV ULG.
 - Having baseline level might be good at campus-level. A way to measure diversity across diverse fields but in a way that actually allows us to collect data and assess. The more we try to prescribe to the units, the more difficult it will be to get info that is assessible.
- Assessment should focus on curricular opportunities that all students have at UWB
 - All students have to take a DIV course, could be good place to start
 - DIV courses should be meeting the basic DIV objectives
 - No data on DIV course-level assessment. Could look at 1-2 DIV classes per unit. Possibly reach out to professors of most popular DIV courses
 - DIV designation approval documents would be more helpful than syllabus
 - Looking at DIV courses in each unit gives opportunity to see how the DIV LOs are implemented through that unit's lens

- Transfer students may have taken a DIV course at other institutions but those courses are usually articulated in similar ways across schools.
- Dyba summarized: CCAL consensus is to use critical perspectives framework from 2014 working group and also identify unit exemplars (CCAL reps welcome to suggest). Sinkler will provide Dyba with data on most commonly taken DIV courses.

Reflections on IUPUI Assessment Institute Presentation

- How might this inform the assessment work at UWB short term or long term?
 - Climate survey and NSSE data could be helpful
 - UWB has done work in disaggregating data with hope of getting people to engage data in ways they can use with an eye toward changing practice when necessary
 - Are there open response questions on NSSE surveys?
 - Yes, they are hard to analyze
 - When disaggregating data for minoritized students, may want to look at the open-ended questions for important info and leads to follow up on
 - Is climate survey data owned by IR?
 - No. Have to ask Office of Education Assessment for the data
- San Diego used data survey and diversity designated courses to assess ULG
- How realistic is it for UWB to pull example of student work to analyze one dimension of diversity work in classes and develop rubric to serve other assessment efforts? How likely that can be implemented at UWB?
 - IRB not necessary as it is institutional data being used at the institution and is not a formal research project.
 - In regard to asking student permission, if the work is being kept within the institution, student permission is necessary but we should consider.
 - IAS asks for student permission and it poses a significant limitation.
- Cultural pluralism/multicultural diversity weighed against critical theory/critical perspectives. Does the Diversity ULG (as it is currently stated) fall within one of those?
 - As currently stated, Diversity ULG clearly a multicultural framing however in the other frameworks presented today it touches upon critical theory as well.
 - Schools have their own diversity learning outcomes, some are multicultural and some are critical theory. Those differences could spark conversation.
 - How CCAL assesses Diversity ULG could be framework that could be used by new assessment coordinator to systematically assess all ULGs
- Important to remember that San Diego is a different type of institution in that they have a core curriculum they could use for assessment
- Some schools use canvas to assess across classes. A module dropped in to courses that is an assessment for faculty to complete. Could be developed as pilot at UWB.

Finish Review of Future Plans Survey

Adrian Sinkler

- Future Plans Survey originally developed for career center's accreditation process, geared toward post-graduation plans. Brought to CCAL to determine if ULG assessment can be included. Issue is that there are a lot of questions, making it cumbersome.
- Need to determine if there are NSSE items that map to ULG assessment. Alignment doesn't mean it has to be worded the same way.

- IR plans to take NSSE and Future Plans survey results and run interitem validity tests across to identify strong correlations between different items on different surveys that are already known to measure the same thing. That will determine if ULGs can be assessed using with career assessment questions.
 - First, need to determine if questions are going to be revised. If they get revised, will not be able to compare to previous years.
 - NSSE survey will run in March and Future Plans survey after that
 - A lot of post grad outcome info now comes from Employment Security Division and Student Clearing House so do not have to ask as make post grad questions.
 - Idea is to see if there is a consistent cluster of responses to lead us to believe that they are measuring the same concept

Discussion:

- Survey running 2nd week of May, giving CCAL time to provide comments/feedback to IR
- 2 versions of survey being considered and one will be picked
- Some ULGs will not be well-represented on iteration but doing complete rework won't work. First need to determine if surveys measure what needs to be measured. If not, start thinking about it differently. Maybe focus specifically on ULGs next time.
- Sinkler will share NSSE questions that map to ULGs with CCAL
- Musselman suggested Dyba find out from San Diego point of contact if they have identified NSSE questions that correlate with their DISJ courses.

Musselman summarized that CCAL will share feedback and correspondence with IR but will not wordsmith survey questions but, instead, will wait and see how survey outcomes correspond to ULGs.

Meeting Adjourned

Minutes submitted by Dawn Moncalieri
Meeting adjourned 1:30pm
The next CCAL meeting will be Apr 7, 1:30 – 3:30pm