Faculty representing each of the five academic colleges assessed student work from Diversity and Social assignments after receiving comprehensive calibration and assessment training. Experienced at this work, most of these faculty have assessed ILO student work for at least 4 years, have led assessment training, and have also participated in other faculty assessment committees.

As part of the process, faculty provided detailed feedback and recommendations. During the first three years of ILO assessment, faculty assessor feedback had been integrated into the Closing the Loop report rather than the "Results" report. This fourth year, faculty assessors unanimously agreed that given the significant patterns, it was meaningful to include faculty assessor feedback into college “Closing the Loop” discussions.

Key themes have been identified followed by related faculty quotes from both the Diversity and Social Justice assessments. Because feedback was similar for both assessments, they were combined.

**Overall student work was strong….. but not necessarily in rubric categories that were assessed**

> “It was inspiring and rewarding to see how well students performed, even if the artifacts were not completely aligned to the rubric.”

- “There was some outstanding student work about social justice that clearly showed students have knowledge of the concepts.”
- “... it is nice to see students sometimes thinking about diversity (at least along the lines of what is in the rubric) even when the instructor does not ask for it.”
- “When instructions are clear and related to the rubric categories, students usually do great work. Some of the assignments are really interesting and thought-provoking.”
- “Some assignments really captured the spirit of the rubric well, and those resulted in good work from students.”
- “There was some very impressive student work in this collection.”
- “… I was really impressed with the thoughtfulness of the students in their assignments, and it was inspiring.”
- “Students performed well when the instructions were clear.”
- “Students performed well when given the opportunity to do so.”
- “I really enjoyed reading some student reflections!”
- “In general, students performed well when assignment instructions provided them with aligned directions.”
Student scores related mostly to alignment of assignment instructions with rubric categories
This was the most frequent feedback from faculty assessors.

“When the assignment doesn’t prompt them to address the criteria, assessors have to score the artifacts lower than the student likely deserves, which does a disservice to both our students and the wonderful teaching that is happening on our campus.”

“We don’t want faculty thinking that our students don’t know about social justice (or diversity, or information literacy or whatever) when sometimes they were not asked to talk about these topics in their assignments.”

“We can’t assess student learning without having prompts that address the categories on the rubric. The rubric is devised by faculty and we agree that these categories are important for students to know before they graduate.”

- “I feel that students are learning, it is just that the assignments aren’t necessarily asking them to provide evidence of that learning, which is unfortunate.”
- “I feel as though the assessment doesn’t necessarily reflect student learning; sometimes it is a reflection of lack of alignment between assignment and rubric.”
- “A lot of what we are seeing in terms of low scores might be related to lack of poor alignment between assignment and rubric. When given the opportunity, students usually shine!”
- “I don’t feel that the low scores for students reflect their learning at all, just that some assignments were not aligned with all criteria.”
- “Students are assessed better when the instructions ask students to think about the categories on the rubric. That is what we have to assess and if something isn’t there (like advocacy), then we can’t assess it—meaning it gets a 1.”
- “In general, students performed well when assignment instructions provided them with aligned directions.”
- “I am convinced that sometimes we are assessing the results of the assignment instructions…”
- “Alignment, alignment, alignment.”
Short assignments scored low
Some assignments limited the length of student responses (e.g. 1-2 paragraphs).

“Short assignments frequently led to superficial analysis or explanations.”

- Short assignments correlated with poor scores.
- Short assignments were really difficult to assess, as it was hard to find evidence for everything in the rubric.

What faculty assessors would like faculty to know

“Please look at the rubric to make sure your assignment aligns with the categories on the rubric. If it doesn’t, then please adjust your assignment. The assessment process is supposed to indicate if our students are mastering these ILOs but sometimes the assessment results are really about whether or not the assignment instructions include the relevant materials from the rubric. The rubric materials were created by faculty and approved by faculty and contain what faculty believe are important for students to master. Please use it.”

- Instructors need to take more time examining the rubric and incorporating the categories into their assignment that is presented for assessment. I don’t mean ‘teaching to the rubric’ but I do mean that if the rubric is assessing cultural self-awareness, then instructors need to ask students to discuss cultural self-awareness, somehow, in their assignment.
- “I also think students benefit from looking at the rubric and discussing the rubric. I believe the rubric can be used as a pedagogical instrument itself.”
- “Low scores may mean lack of assignment prompts rather than lack of learning. So please check if that particular criteria is covered in the course AND the assignment. Faculty are doing amazing work helping students excel in the ILOs. But they should also provide more opportunities to reflect on many critical aspects.”