



Diversity and Social Justice Closing the Loop University Summary Report

February 23, 2023 v2

Cal State East Bay University-wide discussions, recommendations, and actions taken as a result of assessment of Diversity and Social Justice student learning in the 2021-22 and academic and co-academic discussions in the 2022-2023 academic year to improve student learning and students' experiences at Cal State East Bay.

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

This *Closing the Loop University Summary Report* summarizes the discussions, recommendations, and actions being taken by academic colleges, co-academic, and administrative units to improve student learning and student experiences at Cal State East Bay for diversity and social justice.

Background

[Institutional Learning Outcomes \(ILOs\)](#) are those learning outcomes that are expected of every graduate of the institution, both undergraduate and graduate, and are closely aligned with [General Education](#) requirements. ILO Assessment follows the [ILO Long Term Assessment Plan](#) which aligns the schedule of assessment for undergraduate, graduate, and general education assessment.

Following the schedule for the ILO Long Term Assessment plan, Cal State East Bay gathered student learning data in a report titled, [University Summary Report: Assessment of Diversity and Social Justice Student Learning, August 2021](#).

Assessment data regarding graduate programs were presented in a report entitled [Graduate Programs University Summary Report: Diversity and Social Justice](#). These data provided additional context for existing academic review discussions, analysis, and decision-making to improve student learning for diversity and social justice.

COLLEGE & UNIT SUMMARIES

College of Business and Economics (CBE)

We had a closing-the-loop meeting for social justice (CBE does not have diversity). We shared the assessment results, discussed the weakness and strength of our students, and provided very useful thoughts on improvement.

Our faculty believe they need to share the content and assignments with all who teach MGMT 300, and they need to work on developing skills in more of an informal way than a formal way. In almost every management course, there is always an ethics component so there is the starting point and social justice may be included informally as part of the ethics conversations. Discussions of the four principles of social justice (equity, access, participation, rights) may be being discussed more as a corollary or side issue rather than being dealt with directly. Faculty also found that our students have already, in some cases, been exposed to the concepts of social justice from their prior educational experiences.

According to the report, there appear to be two areas of gaps: 1) the students inability to mobilize actions to address social justice and 2) the instructors not applying or practicing the precepts of social justice. To close the gaps, our faculty will continually look at case studies and scenarios and ask the students to go through the process of applying ethical judgment to determine "What would be the best ethical actions to take in that particular situation?" The usage of case studies and scenarios can also be a springboard for expanded conversations about social justice. Faculty also think it is necessary to be more aware and conscious of injecting in a more formal way the applications of social justice and applying them ourselves in our interactions with the students.

Our faculty also mentioned that if we use MGMT 300 as an example and a critical starting point, it might be useful if we have a standardized assessment that is given to all students at the beginning of the course to measure and evaluate the level of understanding and comprehension of the applicability of social justice concepts to business and to the students' experience here at CSUEB. We instructors could review the results and determine when and in what ways we can insert additional material and exercises in any of the four categories (contexts, power structures, critical perspectives, advocacy) which might be lacking for those particular students. In this way, we can address the specific needs of each section of MGMT 300.

College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS)

CEAS Summary of discussion

The Diversity and Social Justice report was shared with CEAS faculty. Each department reviewed the report at a faculty meeting and shared their feedback. The college has two departments with undergraduate programs and three departments that are focused on post-baccalaureate credential programs, MS degrees, and a doctorate in Educational Leadership.

Reviewing the feedback from the departments, a number of themes emerged.

1. The results did not fully align with instructors' perceptions of competence in these areas for both undergraduate and graduate students.

2. The sample size in the college was very low to draw meaningful conclusions. It was also felt the sample might be biased as the courses used to assess the ILOs were focused on diversity and social justice.
3. There seem to be inconsistencies between rubrics used to assess these learning outcomes in class for SLOs and rubrics used for PLOs and then the rubrics used for the ILOs.
4. Students seemed to have more problems with critical perspectives and advocacy in the social justice assessment, assignments should be revised to focus more on those two areas.

CEAS Summary of actions proposed/implemented: Suggestions for the future

1. Expand the number of classes used to assess diversity and social justice at the undergraduate level.
2. Address the misalignment between the assessments used and the rubrics.
3. Require greater consistency/training in the use of rubrics.

College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences (CLASS)

CLASS "Closing the Loop" Report 2023

Diversity & Social Justice ILO Assessment

On October 25 and 26, 2022 and November 2 and 3, 2022 CLASS held open forums to discuss "Closing the Loop" on ILO assessment. During the first two forums focused on the Diversity ILO assessment results and during the last two, the focus was on the Social Justice ILO assessment results. The meetings were held via Zoom. All CLASS faculty were invited to attend. In total, the forums were attended by 20 faculty, some of whom attended more than one forum. Participants included representation from AGES, Art, Criminal Justice, English, Ethnic Studies, History, Human Development, Modern Languages & Literatures, Political Science, Public Administration, and Theater & Dance. All forums began with a discussion of forum goals followed by an overview of the university-wide assessment process and the respective rubric criteria, a presentation of assessment results (including comparisons between CLASS and the University as a whole), and concluded with robust discussions about the results and paths forward.

In the discussion of the Diversity ILO, faculty expressed concern over the small number of courses assessed (7) and how assessment results, as a result, might not be an accurate measure of overall student learning. Faculty similarly noted that CLASS offered the majority of Diversity courses on campus (106 out of 148) and expressed a desire to see more colleges offer diversity courses. In terms of results, faculty believe the accuracy of CLASS students' high scores on "respect for diverse perspectives." There was a robust discussion of CLASS students' lower scores on self-reflection. Faculty wondered if the low scores might be attributed to insufficient opportunities for self-reflection as those types of assignments might be regarded (incorrectly) by some faculty as "soft" and "not rigorous."

Overall, however, faculty expressed concern as to the validity of the results and any ability to draw meaningful conclusions due to a number of factors. One concern was how much of a factor the Covid-19 pandemic and online learning had (given when the courses were assessed). A larger concern was a likely disconnect between what was being taught, what was being learned, and what was being measured. As there is no requirement for instructors to explicitly include the ILO rubric in their assignments or show students the rubric, it is difficult to

determine whether students were not learning about diversity, were not being taught about diversity, or whether what they were learning was being accurately measured by the rubric/assessors. In addition, the fact that the ILO rubric and Diversity overlay are different likely add additional confusion. Similarly, faculty questioned the value of assessing only one artifact as a measure of what students learn throughout an entire course. Not all instructors incorporate summative assignments that hit on all rubric criteria.

Thinking about ways forward, faculty discussed some possible directives, many of which involve offering additional support to instructors, via Faculty Learning Communities, workshops, or other professional development opportunities. For example, instructors may benefit from guidance in planning their assignments to align better with the rubric criteria, to learn of opportunities to incorporate reflective and metacognitive assignments into their courses, and how to harness the diversity already present in our classrooms as a framework for course content. On a related point, faculty suggested that maybe class dialogue, and not individual student assignments, might be a better measure of student learning.

The next two forums concerned the results of the Social Justice ILO Assessment. There was significant overlap with the previous discussions, with concerns about the number of artifacts assessed, continuity between assignment guidelines students were given and the rubrics used for assessment, whether the artifacts assessed were sufficiently summative that they provided a platform for students to demonstrate all four criteria, and how faculty could do a better job inviting students to make links between their lived experiences and course content. Faculty similarly noticed how CLASS offers the majority of social justice courses. Faculty expressed a desire for other colleges to offer more, but simultaneously recognized the expertise CLASS have in these areas.

In terms of reactions to the results presented, faculty noted the lower scores for the advocacy criterion. They questioned how many of the courses and artifacts even asked students to think about agency. Are we assessing students on something instructors are not teaching or asking their students to include in their assignments? It is also possible that instructors and assessors have different working definitions of "advocacy." Inviting students to make connections between their lives and their coursework could be beneficial here. When students reflect on injustices they have faced and how they addressed them, it can highlight ways to further advocate for justice for themselves as well as others.

Some faculty suggestions for moving forward include incorporating a way for an assessor to determine that, if the artifact's guidelines do not require students to cover all four criteria, it should not be assessed. Alternatively, allow for the assessment of multiple, smaller, artifacts per course? This latter practice, of using multiple smaller assignments, aligns more closely with best teaching practices. A related question was whether instructors could identify which rubric categories are addressed in their assignment, thereby creating a strong link between assignment guidelines and assessment criteria. A broader suggestion was to think of ways students could be more involved in the assessment process, in addition to assessing the artifacts they create in class.

College of Science (CSCI)

The College of Science held two virtual 1.5 hour meetings, one each for Diversity and Social Justice, for discussion of the results. Additionally, comments were collected via shared Google docs. The entire faculty was invited with efforts made such that each department be represented by at least one faculty member. The discussions were a way of educating faculty about the ILO's, the rubrics, and the processes behind the assessments and applying for overlay status. After a presentation on the above and the results, the faculty had an open dialogue during the Diversity meeting.

Faculty mentioned the disconnect between the greater diversity found in our student body and the fact that $\frac{1}{3}$ of our students felt that they didn't belong, according to the "My Story, My Truth" survey. This is unfortunate, but lends credence to the idea that diversity doesn't mean inclusion. International students have shared their frustration at not feeling included. During the discussion faculty mentioned that this may appear in class participation. For example, faculty may know that students know the answer, but the students may not feel comfortable talking in class. They also discussed the fact that students are aware of actions that are taken or not taken (by the faculty) that set the tone of the classroom and may not specifically be topic-related.

We discussed biases given that students, on average, scored lower on the self-reflection element of the diversity rubric. It was suggested that it may be beneficial to normalize the fact that we all have biases through faculty sharing their own past or present biases. We also need to ensure that students won't be penalized for their honest reflections which may not be politically correct or always aware of diversity. Professions and disciplines also have their own conscious or unconscious biases associated with them that may ultimately be reflected in the classroom. These need to be explicitly acknowledged if change is to take place.

We used a different approach for the Social Justice meeting in that we had a "virtual walkabout" during which faculty "moved" in breakout rooms to discuss and answer three questions to prompt thoughtful discussion:

1. How have social injustices been perpetuated in your discipline?
2. In what ways do you envision your discipline advancing social justice?
3. What characteristics come to mind when thinking of a socially just learning environment?

This change in format was made because College of Science only had one course that was used for ILO assessment, a NURS course taken only by majors, so we did not think the results were widely applicable. Several themes emerged from these discussions that span current practices, challenges, and next steps as described below.

Many faculty acknowledged the role that their discipline has historically played in perpetuating social injustices. We see this in Nursing and Public Health, for example, with how medical testing is conducted. Statistics is the foundation for eugenics. In other disciplines, we see resource extraction. To this day, many of our professional societies have not shown leadership around this issue and don't serve as resources for faculty. Some curricular materials have been slow to be updated. In general, there continues to be an emphasis on valuing the academic path over legitimate concerns about getting a job and making enough money. Top accolades, such as the Nobel Prizes in sciences, are overwhelmingly awarded to North Americans and Europeans.

Given the identified success and challenges, the discussion lent itself to some opportunities for action. College of Science faculty professed interest and commitment to teaching in a socially just manner. To them, this means valuing different lived experiences, creating curriculum that is of interest to our students, and giving space for social justice discussions and current events. Workshops on universal design for learning were recommended.

Much of the discussion focused on how we assign grades to students. For example, giving points for attendance and participation can have its issues. Does participation always mean talking? What about someone who is actively taking notes and helps other students outside of class? Is the classroom environment one in which everyone is comfortable talking? Many of us are still learning how to broaden our thinking around student assessment, having been ourselves assessed by only a few modes. However, we see how these impact minoritized groups more. We are caught in the middle in some sense because our students may still need to prepare for high stakes, multiple choice exams (such as the NCLEX to become a registered nurse). However, for most of our students they will never have high stakes exams again. Can we align our teaching and assessment of learning more closely with what our students need for successful lives?

We need to disrupt the historical cycles by acknowledging the discipline's role in injustice and helping students explicitly see how their disciplinary knowledge can help their communities and fight injustice. It was generally agreed on that promoting social justice for our students should include making sure they understand all the opportunities available to them with their degree option and find the overlap with their interests, needs, values, and constraints. Part of doing this is for faculty to increase their own knowledge. We do this when we bridge our students to their communities, when we talk with them individually to learn about their abilities and interests, when we mentor them in our research teams and connect them with internships, when we help them get the resources they need to be successful, and when we are explicit about social justice issues relevant to our classes.

Outside of this work by faculty, the College has also initiated some specific actions in light of these conversations. A "best practices" syllabus guide was created and will be inserted for faculty (not student) to view in College of Science Canvas shells starting Summer 2023. Accompanying this was a two-page infographic on modifying syllabi to be more inclusive. Given that faculty-mentored research and internship experiences are high-impact practices shown to particularly benefit minoritized communities in STEM, the College of Science has applied for funding for two STEM VISTA positions to examine equity in these experiences for our students, design infrastructure to more efficiently collect this participation data, and improve outreach and participation.

University Libraries

Summary of discussion

The results of the Social Justice and Diversity assessments were discussed with the Library faculty and SCAA (Student Center for Academic Achievement) staff during the Fall 2022 semester. While the Library Faculty are not currently teaching courses that meet these overlay requirements, the support of student learning in the areas of Social Justice and Diversity are woven into library services, collections, and Information Studies credit courses.

Summary of actions proposed/implemented

The Library Faculty, led by the Library Committee on Instruction and Curriculum, successfully proposed a minor in Critical Information Studies during the academic year 2022-2023. The minor proposal includes both new courses and revisions to existing Information Studies courses. Course-level learning outcomes that align with criteria on both the Social Justice and Diversity ILO rubrics are now included for several courses within the minor (INFO 200, INFO 250, INFO 390).

The Library Faculty recently adopted program learning outcomes which align with the revised and newly developed courses. Two of the new program learning outcomes are now focused on social justice and diversity, aligning to criteria from both the Social Justice and Diversity ILO rubrics:

 PLO 2: Develop a critical understanding of the social, political, and economic contexts and power imbalances/dynamics through which information is created, disseminated, accessed, and used.

 PLO 4: Participate in developing a diverse, equitable and inclusive world by recognizing the value, legitimacy, and interconnectedness of a variety of systems of knowledge, including those based on research and expertise from communities, research institutions, and individual lived experience.

The new program learning outcomes will be part of the department's five-year assessment plan starting in academic year 2023-2024.

The Library also works to highlight resources in our collections that tie into the Diversity and Inclusion Student Center's Cultural Awareness months, which support student learning related to Diversity and Social Justice. Student assistants in the Library Student Ambassador program are responsible for the selection of included materials. These displays are available in person in the CORE building on the Hayward campus or on the Library's website: [Online Resources for Cultural Awareness Months](#). The library faculty are continually adding new resources to the library collections to support student learning related to Diversity and Social Justice, both in print and online. There is a continuing effort to purchase materials by authors from historically marginalized groups in all collections. There are a significant number of new electronic resources available from the library (e.g. *Civil Rights and Social Justice*, *Ethnic Diversity Source*, among many others) and the library faculty will continue to add new collections resources as the library budget allows.

Graduate Studies

Per-program ILO assessment results and analysis of the collected data was provided in the program annual reports submitted to the [Committee on Academic Planning and Review](#) (CAPR) in October 2023. Those results were collected into a university report entitled [Graduate Programs University Summary Report: Diversity and Social Justice](#) which was shared with the Graduate Advisory Council (GAC) at the Spring 2023 GAC meeting. The Graduate Advisory Council is made up of the Graduate Coordinators of each graduate program,

as well as representatives from Graduate Admissions, the Office of the Registrar, University Extension, and other university offices.

Summary of discussion: Annual reports to CAPR showed a strong commitment from programs to actively teach and assess diversity and social justice skills. The methods used were strongly discipline-specific and tied to per-program coursework and program learning outcomes. This is in contrast to more general methods which had been proposed to teach and assess the written communication or information literacy ILOs. It would be advantageous to consider if there is the opportunity to provide university-wide learning opportunities to support the per-program activities. For instance, in addition to assessing their student's coursework, the Department of Educational Leadership conducted a survey and focus groups to gather feedback about student experiences regarding five social justice principles, student support in their program, and other issues. The Speech Language and Hearing Science program maintains an Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, and Access (IDEA) Committee which proposed a mentoring program for new students and also proposed partial funding of graduate school applications for undergraduates from historically under-represented groups. As has been suggested in previous reports, wider dissemination of effective closing the loop strategies to all programs and departments could lead to less duplication of effort. Where possible, university sponsored initiatives could lead to greater improvements in student learning than activities limited to a single department or college.

An additional on-going topic of discussion concerned the logistics of the ILO assessment process. Reporting was simplified in the last year as ILO assessment data need be reported only to CAPR, and not separately to the Office of Graduate Studies. CAPR also clarified its policy on assessment data to be reported by programs undergoing a five-year review. There are still a number of concerns however that specifically affect graduate programs. This is due to the different assessment strategies used for undergraduate and graduate programs. Undergraduate programs are assessed uniformly using the same assignment guide and rubric for all collected work, regardless of college or program. Graduate programs are assessed individually by the program itself. The type of assignment and rubric are specified by the individual program. The concerns raised included:

- It is not possible to produce results that can be compared with undergraduate assessment results or between graduate programs due to the wide variety of rubrics and criteria used.
- Some programs are forced to do double assessment, assessing student work once with a PLO rubric and once with the associated ILO rubric in the same year.
- The assessment schedule of some programs does not align with the university ILO schedule, specifically for programs with discipline-specific accreditations. For example, a program may be required to assess a PLO on written communication one year for its discipline-specific accreditation, and then assess the ILO on written communication another year according to the [ILO Long Term Assessment Plan](#).

Summary of actions proposed/implemented: The issues regarding ILO assessment logistics were brought to university assessment leadership, and the following solutions were proposed:

- University results will be qualitative in nature rather than quantitative for example, recurring challenges among programs, improvement in similar criteria, or common closing the loop suggestions. Quantitative assessment results will be specific to individual programs only due to the wide variation in ILO assessment goals, criteria, and rubrics used.

- When reporting ILO assessment results, programs may report the results of the PLO assessment for the PLO which aligns with the required ILO. Hence, collected work may be assessed using just one rubric, the PLO rubric.
- A program must report ILO assessment data according to the university ILO long term assessment schedule. If a program has already assessed the aligned PLO earlier in the 5-year cycle, however, they may report those results rather than collecting and assessing new data for the current year.

These changes to ILO assessment policy are in keeping with the observation that graduate programs differ greatly in their goals and expectations. The GAC has reaffirmed the desire of individual programs to assess ILOs using the method most fitting to their program on multiple occasions. The above changes will help to streamline the process, both reducing the effort required, and providing data that might not have been available otherwise due to ILO assessment scheduling.

Academic Programs and Services (APS): Office of Educational Effectiveness & General Education

Summary of discussion: The [University Summary Report](#) assessment results for Diversity and Social Justice were posted in August 2022, and distributed to the Educational Effectiveness Council which includes college assessment leadership for campus-wide discussions and decision making in the fall term. The report was also presented at the ILO Subcommittee and CAPR in fall, 2022. The summary of the recommendations and actions taken is being presented and discussed during the Spring 2023 term university-wide in a variety of faculty governance forums including EEC meetings, the ILO Subcommittee, the Committee on Academic Planning and Review (CAPR) and Academic Senate.

Summary of actions proposed/implemented

The Overlay courses (Social Justice, Diversity, Sustainability) represent the intersection of [other breadth graduation requirements](#), contain upper division GE, and also represent our [Institutional Learning Outcomes](#). The Office of GE is leading the efforts to update the course learning outcomes for all Overlay courses in faculty governance committees. Having been originally developed as part of Semester Conversion in 2015, the course learning outcomes will benefit from integrating campus and national advancements in these areas as well as consideration from the first cycle of assessment. The ILO measurement rubrics will then be updated to align to the revised learning outcomes. The Office of GE will also be separating out the Upper Division GE course data from our ILO assessment results in order to get a snapshot of how UDGE courses compare to the rest of campus.

Institutional Effectiveness and Research (IER)

Summary of discussion:

IER has made an effort to share relevant ILO results with co-curricular areas to further institutional conversations about diversity and social justice beyond the classroom. While student services/student affairs have not historically taken part in the analysis of ILO assessment, dissemination of the diversity and social justice dashboards to these areas have helped advance conversations about how co-curricular departments can augment student learning related to these two outcomes.

Summary of actions proposed/implemented

Student Affairs is utilizing a new “assessment report template” that asks each functional area that is scheduled ([on a 5-year rotating basis](#)) to undergo a comprehensive assessment to inventory the activities and corresponding learning outcomes related to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) that are specific to that department. Student affairs areas are instructed to cite the specific data, assessments, or demonstrated outcomes from signature programs that advance DEI at East Bay, which may help inform/enhance continuous improvement activities for the institution. Ultimately, IER hopes that increased access to relevant ILO assessment results between divisions will facilitate more informed and targeted decision making and collaborations between academic affairs and student affairs related to closing the loop activities.

Office of Faculty Development (OFD)

Summary of discussion and actions implemented

Integrating Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (JEDI) into Course Assignments and Pedagogy through Faculty Fellow Mentoring Supporting Student Success: Nick Baham, Chair and Professor of Ethnic Studies, with support from APS, led projects helping faculty meet the Diversity Overlay learning outcomes. The first project in 2020-2021 was leading a cross-disciplinary faculty group through the development of an [ILO Diversity Assignment Guide](#). In 2021-2022 Nick mentored faculty one-on-one fine-tuning ILO Diversity Overlay assignments that were [identified for assessment](#). As faculty feedback was very positive about changes they made to pedagogy and curriculum, in 2022-2023 OFD and APS collaborated on a related initiative to integrate diversity, equity, and inclusion into course assignments and pedagogy through peer mentoring. This initiative provided faculty across the university with the opportunity to work in a peer mentoring capacity to reimagine and/or create an assignment and related pedagogy that intentionally used a Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (JEDI) lens. The 10 participating faculty indicated in their feedback how “valuable” the experience was citing the “supportive,” “thoughtful,” “purposeful,” “insightful,” and “meaningful” mentoring experiences. This highlights the value of one on one mentoring and the benefits of this type of working model. A broad range of changes were made from the exchange of ideas including syllabus, curriculum, assignments, and pedagogy.

Metacognition Self-Reflection Module for Faculty: During late October and early November, 2022 CLASS held four open forums to discuss “closing the loop” on the assessment of our Social Justice and Diversity Institutional Learning Outcomes. These open forums were attended by 20 faculty, some of whom attended more than one forum. The forums included a robust discussion of the assessment results, including the apparent gaps in several areas that called for self-reflection. As a result of closing the loop discussion, CLASS partnered with OFD to design and fund a working group to create a “module” for faculty on designing self-reflective assignments. This module will be available to all faculty via the Canvas Commons site.