



Closing the Loop University Summary Report

April 15, 2022

Cal State East Bay University-wide discussions, recommendations, and actions taken as a result of assessment of Sustainability, Social Responsibility, and Oral Communication student learning in the 2020-21 and academic and co-academic discussions in the 2021-2022 academic year to improve student learning.

INTRODUCTION

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 three reports titled, [University Summary Report Sustainability, September 2021](#), [University Summary Report Oral Communication, September 2021](#), and [University Summary Report Social Responsibility, November, 2021](#). Assessment data regarding graduate programs were presented into two reports titled, [Graduate Programs University Summary Report: Oral Communication](#), and [Graduate Programs University Summary Report: Sustainability](#), where the latter report comprises data on both the Sustainability and Social Responsibility ILOs. These data provided additional context for existing academic review discussions, analysis, and decision-making to improve student learning for sustainability, oral communication, and social responsibility.

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 for sustainability, oral communication, and social responsibility.

Note about COVID-19 Impact

While the COVID-19 pandemic has impacted the University's operations on an ongoing basis starting with the "Shelter in Place" order on March 17th, 2020, and the return to in-person activities at the start of the Spring 2022 term, the University continues to evolve, adjust, and remain committed to continue a broad range of assessment and closing the loop activities that support teaching, the assessment of student learning. As Oral Communication was assessed during the shelter in place order, all presentations were recorded by faculty/students using Zoom, GoReact (a Blackboard video tool) and other tools.

COLLEGE & UNIT SUMMARIES

College of Business and Economics (CBE)

The College of Business and Economics (CBE) did not have any course assessed for Social Responsibility in this assessment cycle, so we do not have a closing the loop report for this ILO.

The College of Business and Economics had a one one-hour virtual closing the loop meeting for Oral Communication. We invited all faculty members who have taught this course to attend the meeting. We discussed many different topics on this, but we mainly focused on the current assessment data, effectiveness of past improvement actions, and recommended course-level or program-level new improvement actions. This was indeed a good learning experience for all the faculty participants who are working so hard to help our students to develop oral communication skills.

Here are first-hand observations from our faculty: 1) our students are brave to speak up; they are very active and eager to ask questions, even for those very simple questions; 2) not all of our students want to engage in classroom discussions, so sometimes we need to call their names to encourage them to participate; 3) students make only claims in presentations, but do not provide enough evidence; 4) case studies with required questions seem to be working well and such case studies can ensure our students to prepare for classroom discussions and to prepare for questions and answers; 5) faculty need to give students more time on classroom discussions on the cases and more opportunities for presentations to improve students' confidence in oral communication.

Faculty provided many insightful tips on improvement actions. For example, some faculty suggested requiring students to do each assignment and to attend each scheduled class session so that students would be prepared for classroom discussions. Others agreed that increased feedback on presentations seems very important and can help students to improve their presentation skills. It is also generally agreed that the college needs to share with all faculty (not just those teaching courses assessed in this cycle) the rubric and expectations for oral communication, so that we may involve more faculty in this assessment process and make this a responsibility for all the faculty in this program.

College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS)

The College of Education and Allied Studies (CEAS) presented the findings of the Oral Communication, Sustainability and Social Responsibility findings to both the CEAS Strategic Planning Committee and the CEAS EEC Committee. Additionally, as all of the classes selected are from the Department of Kinesiology, the department distributed the reports and had a department meeting discussion on the findings.

Through several discussions, the consensus is that there are only a few instructors each semester for each ILO who are willing to use their course for the targeted ILO assessment. A broader conversation on findings is difficult given the small sample size under review from the college.

Given the small sample size, the number of courses assessed would suggest a heavy reliance on the Department of Kinesiology. As a college with two undergraduate departments, CEAS does not have the breadth and depth of programs to draw on for such assessments to yield meaningful results. Consequently,

the amount of data makes it hard to draw firm conclusions on student performance. One recommendation moving forward would be to find ways to get more instructors involved and use more courses and not the same courses each cycle.

Adding to the challenges of drawing meaningful conclusions, and a recurring concern, is that the definitions of the ILOs do not easily align with the work in HRT and KIN. For example, in Kinesiology, sustainability as classically defined is a stretch. Sustainability is not something that is directly addressed, but tends to be an indirect consequence of certain actions and/or an ethical perspective in Kinesiology. In the Department of Hospitality, Recreation and Tourism, the Sustainability rubric does not apply to any assignment in courses in the HRT program that were certified with a Sustainability Overlay, which is a challenge. Faculty commented that the Sustainability rubric tries to cover too much. One recommendation was to go through a process of prioritizing parts of the rubric for a course/department's specific purposes.

As in the challenges with the Sustainability ILO in Kinesiology, for the Social Responsibility ILO, the department promotes advocacy and evidence-based practice but this underpins the work conducted rather than being a specific element of the course content. This makes it very hard to assess the ILO. A suggestion is to have collaborative sessions between faculty to glean what the higher performing courses did so that other faculty could benefit from their knowledge and improve courses across the university.

Closely tied to this is the degree to which all elements of a rubric align with any one assignment used to assess the ILO. Often it is only a few categories of the rubric that make sense, and if all categories have to be used, it can feel like the assignment is being forced into the rubric.

Of the ILOs assessed, oral communication seems to be a more 'direct' learning outcome than sustainability and social responsibility, at least in terms of how Kinesiology approaches these outcomes, and much more readily assessed. The data on this seems to indicate the majority of the students were performing at an acceptable level. Feedback included a wider discussion to suggest some specific strategies to address those areas based on what is written in the rubric. Given that there were some challenges using Zoom and GoReact, perhaps there could be a wider discussion supporting the use of new/emerging technology in this area.

As a future step, CEAS would like to look at how the college evaluates the graduate study ILO's to closely align and provide more opportunities to include more programs and departments across the college.

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

The College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences (CLASS) held four virtual 1-hour meetings, two each for Oral Communication and Sustainability. At these meetings, Dr. Kevin Kaatz, our EEC representative, provided a brief overview of the ILO assessment process and the CLASS results of the assessment for each ILO. The two meetings to discuss the Oral Communication ILO were attended by 12 faculty, with representation from Theater, English, Ethnic Studies, Art, Social Work, Political Science, and MLL. Dean Ng also participated in one of the sessions. The Oral Communication meetings took place on 10/19/21 and 10/20/21. The two meetings to discuss the Sustainability ILO were attended by seven faculty total, with representation from Art, English, Sociology, Ethnic Studies, and AGES. The Sustainability meetings took place on 11/2/21 and 11/3/21. All of

the sessions involved spirited and lively discussions about the meaning of the results and the opportunities for improving our College teaching and assessment practices for oral communication and sustainability.

The ILO sharing sessions lasted 50-65 minutes and were held via Zoom. Sessions began with introductions of participants and an overview of the ILO assessment process on our campus and other available institutional data. For the open discussion part of the sessions, Dr. Kaatz provided guiding questions to help structure the conversation and Interim Associate Dean Calvo took notes.

The CLASS courses that were assessed for Oral Communication scored quite high, in the 3.5-4 range in most areas. The faculty who attended the sessions speculated that these high scores are a testament to the way that oral communication skills are introduced in the lower-division GE courses and reinforced in C4, D4, and major courses. To better document student learning in this area, many faculty felt that a portfolio approach could be advantageous. Several faculty also noted that our students often feel more comfortable and “at ease” in expressing themselves verbally and wondered if there is a way to marshal students’ fluency with the spoken word to improve their written work.

Some faculty expressed concerns about the rubric for assessing this ILO. The description of “delivery” reads, “Delivery may include timing, flow, pace, aesthetics, posture, eye contact, voice, professionalism, movement, gestures, and facial expressions.” Several faculty members felt that this description explicitly favors neurotypical and Anglo-Saxon oral communication styles. The faculty suggested that when norming the scoring for these areas, the faculty who are scoring should discuss how to account for cultural differences, including neurodivergence. The faculty in the sessions also had questions about “audience engagement.” While acknowledging the engaging the audience is important, it seems impossible to accurately assess whether the audience was actually engaged or not. Faculty suggested that this category might actually trying to get at “rhetorical awareness,” that is, whether the presenter is thoughtful about who they are trying to reach and how to be effective for that particular audience. Rhetorical awareness would also mean that the category of “delivery” would also be contingent on audience and not a static list of competencies.

To close the loop in this area, faculty suggested revisions to the oral communication ILO rubric in the areas of “delivery” and “audience engagement.” They also suggested sharing the revised rubric with CLASS faculty teaching GE and major courses that require oral presentations.

CLASS courses assessed for the Sustainability rubric on average scored in the 2-2.5 range, indicating the students were not achieving in this area. Conversation among the faculty focused on both the assessment process and what we might do to improve our teaching in this area. Almost all the faculty in the two sessions felt that expecting a single assignment to measure learning in all five areas (agency, interconnectedness, social factors, science, threats/opportunities) was unrealistic. Faculty thought that the artifacts submitted for assessment may not have reflected the learning that occurred in the courses. Faculty noted that scaffolded assignments might have included building blocks that addressed some of the issues that were not reflected in the final assignment. Also, some faculty were unclear if more than one assignment could be submitted. There was a lot of support for adding a “not applicable” possibility to the rubric and allowing faculty to submit assignments that met less than all of the rubric categories.

The rubric category addressing “agency” generated a good deal of discussion among faculty. Faculty wondered if the rubric description “agency” was too limited/limiting and if additional examples of agency would be helpful. Faculty felt that students should be consulted about how to effectively teach about agency (in other words, give students some agency in how this outcome is taught!)

To close the loop, faculty felt that one class was not enough and that sustainability and, especially agency, needed to be built into lower division GE and GS courses in a more holistic and systematic way. We noted that CLASS has strengths in addressing the interconnectedness of the social, cultural, and political factors of sustainability and that we can draw on these strengths to get students thinking about issues of sustainability throughout the curriculum starting in the lower division.

College of Science (CSCI)

The College of Science (CSCI) held three virtual 1.5 hour meetings, one each for Sustainability, Oral Communication, and Social Responsibility, 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 first meeting discussed Sustainability. The faculty identified the major challenge faced as being with the breadth of the rubric itself. In various university-wide discussions since the adoption of the ILO’s, it has been clear that the meaning of the term “sustainability” varies widely depending on person and program affiliation. The overlay definition, and, hence, the rubric tries to encompass all these elements, understandably. However, given our current assessment process of sampling single assignments, many faculty asserted difficulties in addressing all the rubrics in a single assignment. Others indicated that they would not seek a sustainability overlay for a sustainability-related course because it was too complicated to address all elements of the overlay and cover other SLO’s. There was also concern levied regarding poor inter-rater reliability for certain rubric elements (such as “Science.”)

Faculty were most positive about how the concept of sustainability resonates with students’ daily lives and how their engagement is improved with the real-world connections. We discussed the new GE minor in sustainability as a major advance. When done well, courses with a sustainability component can also give students opportunities for agency (e.g. in Oceans, they write letters to government officials or in Solar Suitcase, they actually build solar suitcases for use in underserved regions and teach others how to do so). Such courses are also likely to expose them to previously unconsidered career opportunities.

Given the identified success and challenges, the discussion lent itself to some opportunities for action. Faculty were curious as to if the assessment process itself might be revisited. Could more than one assignment be assessed, each covering a portion of the rubric? Alternatively, could faculty choose to assess only some of the rubric elements or weight them rather than trying to address all rubric elements in what might be a watered-down version? Faculty encouraged each other to sprinkle sustainability concepts in whenever they can with the thinking being that the more opportunities students have to engage with these concepts, the more likely they are to continue to engage with them throughout their lives. The interdisciplinary nature of

sustainability was clear through the discussion and sparked faculty interest in collaborating on teaching these concepts from multiple perspectives, either through guest lectures (for example, exchange of Public Health and Biology faculty) or through more formal team-teaching arrangements (e.g. Solar Suitcase). Finally, it was observed that perhaps certain elements of the sustainability assignments (and others) that proved so engaging could be translated to other assignments and help students see their education as a means of empowerment. A plan was developed to gain student voice in identifying particularly engaging assignments, determine common translatable elements, and creating a repository for faculty. This will be done through the STEM Leadership team who will conduct focus groups with STEM Lab Learning Assistants and members of BIPOC in STEM and work with faculty to track down identified assignments.

The second meeting discussed Oral Communication. One of the major challenges for the University in assessing this ILO was identifying appropriate classes and assignments. Many faculty did not know of the existence of the Communication Lab and one that did refer students there for assistance learned that it was often closed. In communication with the director, this seems to be a direct result of COVID, and not normal. Some faculty observed that students appeared ill-prepared and/or had not practiced before their Zoom presentations. Others indicated that students in research courses seemed to lack experience with long format presentations either as individuals or groups. Some faculty who supported final oral presentations over two semesters with scaffolded writing assignments and feedback throughout indicated that students who stumbled early on normally dropped off or fell through the cracks. COVID seems to have taken a toll on some students' ability to tackle larger projects such as these. The potential value in measuring and documenting students' progress over multiple semesters was put forward, but it was not immediately apparent how to act on this observation.

Several faculty had the opportunity to share their best practices in supporting the development of oral communication skills in students. Public Health requires a first-year seminar that requires many individual and group oral presentations and emphasizes providing constructive feedback. One faculty member shared the worksheet she uses in her class to collect constructive feedback. Another mentioned that discussing the rubric with students beforehand helped them in preparing their presentation. Two faculty mentioned inviting students to practice their presentations in front of the faculty member during office hours to build confidence and give constructive feedback. Then, the faculty member could evaluate the actual presentation as to what had changed based on the suggestions. Faculty observed an improvement in the quality of presentations when pre-recorded in advance using Zoom (rather than live) particularly with timing. Students seem to enjoy using GoReact. They have also demonstrated strong skills in both Powerpoint and video editing.

The challenges and successes discussed above revealed some opportunities for action. Since this discussion, we have sought out relations with the Communications Lab and have advertised its existence as a resource to our faculty. It was generally agreed upon that the Oral Communication ILO and corresponding rubric is very heavily centered on professional oral presentation. The faculty discussed our students' need to improve in other formats of oral communication such as their elevator pitch, interviewing, professional conversations and discussions, and poster presentations. It was agreed that providing more opportunities to practice was essential, particularly in upper-division courses. Some potential means of doing so would be offering more opportunities for role-playing, debates, and poster presentations.

The third meeting focused on Social Responsibility. Faculty expressed concern with identifying assignments (or even courses) able to meet all rubric elements. There was also discussion about what defines student agency around social responsibility, i.e. is it necessary to act on this as part of the course or is it enough to reflect on one's potential? It was also discussed how one's sense of social responsibility takes time to develop as it involves maturing and unlearning deeply embedded constructs (such as structural racism). This seems to require continued engagement with the concept of social responsibility over the course of a student's studies.

It was also recognized that although most programs/courses in the College of Science do not use the term or frame their work in terms of Social Responsibility, all programs not only develop students' agency around social responsibility but also do so from many different angles. Most traditionally, Nursing requires a series of four 1-unit Community Engagement courses where students interact with the community. In the Public Health capstone course, HSC 499, teams of students work directly with community partners on Public Health issues motivated by a sense of social responsibility and come to this realization through this work. In HSC 250, students examine their biases and propose means by which they might improve their cultural sensitivity in working with patients/clients. Engineering faculty mentioned the internationally adopted Code of Ethics introduced to students in Introduction to Engineering and revisited in Senior Design courses. Social responsibility also aligns with PLO's such as Biological Sciences, e.g. application of scientific information and communication of scientific information. Social responsibility in our disciplines also comes out in research ethics, which launched a discussion which included Institutional Review Board approval for human-study research, handling of data, and biases in input datasets in machine learning. Another aspect of Social Responsibility particular to the laboratory sciences is responsible use, synthesis, and disposal of potentially hazardous (including biohazardous materials). In Computer Science, it was recognized that practitioners have social responsibility with respect to data management and privacy issues. Additionally, in the Website Development course, the faculty member has introduced a module on increasing accessibility of websites, raising the idea that creating inclusive environments and tools is part of social responsibility. In Statistics, the ethical need to be responsible with data visualization was identified. Although the construction management industry tends to be profit-focused, more calls for competitions around the design and construction of affordable and net-zero housing have come out recently.

Several actionable ideas arose from the discussion. In general, faculty felt that making an explicit connection to one's social responsibility as a student and practitioner of a discipline was something that could be done in many courses. Since this is a motivating factor for many of our students, we expect an additional benefit of increased student engagement from doing so. Capstone classes, for programs that have them, could be ideal places to initiate assessment on Social Responsibility. This might be in the form of self-reflection, drawing on knowledge and experiences gained through their many courses and gauging their sense of empowerment as they leave the university. To address the ethics side of social responsibility in a manner that might be easily assessed, a multiple choice test of scenarios and potential responses was proposed.

University Libraries

The results of the Oral Communication, Sustainability and Social Responsibility assessments were shared with the Library Faculty, and many action items were generated through discussion at library faculty meetings and collaborative online brainstorming. The below plans may help to increase the University Libraries' impact on improved student learning in these areas.

Oral Communication: To better support student learning related to the "evidence" criteria of the Oral Communication ILO Rubric, the Library Faculty plan to conduct "train the trainer" sessions for Speech Lab Assistants to increase their knowledge of library resources, in order for them to assist other students in using library resources to find evidence for their speech assignments. Additionally, an online research guide devoted to using library resources to find sources for speeches, accessible to all students, will be developed. The Library plays a key role on campus by sharing information about other campus services with the campus community. To that end, all library employees will be informed about the services provided by the Speech Lab to help facilitate effective referrals, and information about the Speech Lab and its services will be posted in the Library's Presentation Practice Room.

Sustainability: The Library provides resources that support sustainability-related pedagogy and research across campus. The Library will undertake an evaluation of the library's electronic and print resources used for sustainability topics to evaluate their breadth and depth, and training sessions for these resources for both library constituents and other campus faculty and staff will be scheduled. The [Sustainability LibGuide](#) will continue to evolve as new resources are added to the Library's collections, and Library-sponsored sustainability-themed educational events will continue to be offered to engage the campus community in discussion of important sustainability topics.

Graduate Studies

Summary of discussion: The results of the Oral Communication, Sustainability and Social Responsibility assessments were shared with the Graduate Advisory Council at the Spring 2022 GAC meeting. Very few programs had aligned with any of the three ILOs being assessed, with four programs aligned to the Oral Communication ILO, and only one program each aligned to the Sustainability and Social Responsibility ILOs. As a result, additional discussion was aimed at evaluating ILO assessment policy and process.

The Oral Communication ILO assessment produced the most useful results as four programs over three colleges had aligned to the ILO. The Oral Communication skill levels of the assessed students were uniformly quite high across all programs and colleges, which was encouraging. This was true despite the diverse nature of the student population and the fact that the primary language of many students was not English. Faculty pointed out that the nature of oral communication was changing from traditional face-to-face real-time presentations to ones mediated by technology. These new forms of presentation might include real-time video-conferencing and/or pre-recorded components, and incorporate chat, whiteboard, slideshows, and other communication methods. These new platforms provide opportunities to more effectively communicate and should be encouraged. It will be important to recognize the diversity of oral communication methods when performing assessment in future cycles.

The Department of Communication COMM Lab was discussed with many programs expressing interest in using their services if graduate level support could be provided. Additionally, it was pointed out that San Jose State conducts workshops on making effective presentations as part of their CSU Research Competition and Grad Slam events. These resources would be very valuable to our students in preparing for their master's thesis or capstone project presentations.

With only one data point for each of the Sustainability and Social Responsibility ILOs, the assessment results cannot be generalized beyond the programs which participated. The one program that assessed the Sustainability ILO recorded very high student skill levels. They had incorporated additional instructor feedback on assessed essays allowing students to address any issues and strengthen their arguments. For the one program that assessed the Social Responsibility ILO, skill levels were also high, and improved from the last cycle in which it was assessed. It was pointed out that the ILO was a bit opaque to the students and that sharing the rubric with them before the assessment was conducted would allow them to address the criteria more easily. It was also noted that clearly addressing the ILO criteria while the material was being taught and tailoring the assignment to be assessed to the rubric would improve the ILO skill levels of the students and more accurately measure those skill levels.

Further data regarding opinions on assessment policy was collected via a survey of GAC members. Members were asked whether graduate programs should concentrate on assessing the WASC core competencies, whether alignments should be modified to ensure representation for all ILOs across all colleges, or whether programs should concentrate on the ILOs which most closely matched their own program goals. The first option would provide the richest data regarding the ILOs that are most closely evaluated by WASC. The second would provide enough data to generalize across the university and so be useful in guiding university initiatives for all ILOs. The third provides the most useful data for individual programs. Results of the survey were mixed with programs split fairly evenly between the options.

Summary of actions proposed/implemented: Regarding Oral Communication ILO assessment, at the university level, the assessment rubric should be reevaluated to ensure that it may be used effectively to assess oral communication provided via multiple modes and incorporating additional technological supports. The COMM Lab should be funded to provide support for graduate students, and the Center for Student Research encouraged to conduct presentation workshops. Individual programs may address program-specific goals through curriculum development, for instance by improving audience engagement through increased interaction.

For the Sustainability and Social Responsibility ILO assessments, the ILOs and associated rubrics should be shared with the students ahead of time so that they can focus on the related skills as they complete their coursework. Students could be exposed to the ILOs as early as orientation and at regular intervals throughout their time at the university.

In terms of assessment policy, Graduate Studies will conduct a pilot program in 22-23 for the Collaboration, Teamwork, and Leadership ILO in which programs may follow the same assessment process as

undergraduate programs. This would decrease the amount of assessment work required of the participating programs and produce more generalizable results.

Department of Communication/The COMM Lab

The Communication Department's Speech Lab [web page](#) has been updated and additional information on services, hours, and contacts has been posted for anyone looking up presentation assistance.

At the beginning of each semester, it will be the practice of the Speech Lab Director to send updated information, and an invitation, to all Departments to disperse to their faculty and staff the appropriate contact information and Lab hours for student referrals to the Speech Lab in any classroom presentation assignments. This promotion of the Speech Lab can also be strengthened by being posted in the Academic Affairs Newsletter, early semester and mid-to-late semester, as a reminder for faculty to use the Lab as a resource and support for their students' presentation assignments.

Additional resources from the Speech Lab are being adjusted to serve students of all majors in their quest for improved presentations. In future semesters, there will be links on the Speech Lab page that will take students to presentation worksheets, checklists, tips, feedback forms, and adjustable templates for presentation outlines, speakers' notes, and presentation aids.

General Education

Summary of discussion: The results of the Fall 2020 pilot assessment for GE A1 Oral Communication were shared in Spring 2021 with faculty in the Department of Communication who were involved in the project. These faculty were involved in all aspects of the process—from rubric development to assignment alignment and evaluation. The project involved the assessment of specific oral presentations for 56 students across multiple sections of COMM 100 Public Speaking. The faculty shared that the assessment results concur with the level of proficiency demonstrated by students in their A1 classes, and with the relatively high pass rate (85.2%) of COMM 100 overall in Fall 2020. The majority (> 80%) of students demonstrated proficiency in most of the A1 rubric dimensions, including reflexivity, messaging, elements of rhetoric, and audience-centered approach. Faculty reported that the skills taught in COMM 100 can be mastered by most students who attend class regularly and engage/apply themselves.

Faculty believed that low proficiency levels in some students could be attributed to outside of school life circumstances that resulted in missing class, not doing the work, being distracted, or mismanaging time. Collectively, students fell below the 80% benchmark in only one dimension: presentation delivery, and it is notable that the evaluation of this dimension also yielded the lowest inter-rater reliability (75%) of all other rubric dimensions. Ideally, inter-rater reliability should be 90% or higher, and for the pilot, inter-rater reliability fell below 84% for all dimensions. Additional calibration and discussion of different faculty perspectives in service of finding a common ground among faculty evaluators could improve inter-rater reliability during the next assessment of A1.

Students taking A1 courses (which includes COMM 100 Public Speaking, COMM 104 Interpersonal Communication, and MLL 111 Speaking of Love: Oral Communication in Multicultural Setting) have the distinct

advantage of access to additional support provided by the Communication Department through the [Speech Lab](#) (also discussed previously). Moving forward, another line of assessment of A1 should include a comparison of pass rates between students who used or did not use the Speech Lab.

Summary of actions proposed/implemented: The faculty involved in the project stated that the GE A1 Oral Communication Rubric reflects a disciplinary approach to oral communication and that revisiting the rubric dimensions, performance indicators, and assignment(s) prior to conducting another assessment project would be beneficial, in order to see if changes are needed. Involving other department faculty, especially a rhetorician, as well as faculty from other departments, particularly Modern Languages & Literatures, is imperative for the next round of A1 assessment.

Faculty discussed the development of oral communication skills as students move from their lower-division into their upper-division courses, particularly upper-division GE (UDGE). At the UDGE level, students should receive support to demonstrate a stronger, more confident presence in terms of oral communication than in the foundational, GE A1 level. UDGE courses should give students ample opportunities and support to refine their oral communication skills by building confidence and increasing sophistication in public speaking. As approaches to oral communication are discipline specific, students need to be able to communicate what they have learned within the context of the discipline. It would be helpful to explore the expectations that faculty from different disciplines have of their student's oral communication skills before graduation, and how those skills are developed in their courses.

As prompted by the GE Director, the Communication faculty discussed strengthening the language for course characteristics/criteria associated with oral communication in both GE A1 and UDGE (namely, UD-C and UD-D) courses with existing oral communication course criteria. These recommendations have now been incorporated into the revised GEOC Framework policy document currently being submitted from the GEOC Subcommittee to CIC for Academic Senate approval. These course characteristics are critical for GEOC course review and increased transparency of student expectations.

Office of Educational Effectiveness

Summary of discussion: The two [University Summary Reports](#) for Sustainability and Oral Communication were posted in September, 2021, and distributed to the Educational Effectiveness Council which includes college assessment leadership for campus-wide discussions and decision making. The ILO Subcommittee completed the assessment of Social Responsibility in the Fall 2021 term, and the [University Summary Report for Social Responsibility](#) was posted and made available in November 2021. The summary of the recommendations and actions taken is being presented and discussed during the Spring 2022 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:

Ongoing EEC discussions to make assessment more meaningful and deepen closing the loop discussions have carried over to the EEC faculty *Core Competency Advisory Group's* (CCAG) work in 2021-22 (including GE) to incorporate faculty and student learning feedback into the refinement of core competency rubrics. This

includes having fewer critical rubric categories to assess. The CCAG has worked on streamlining the ILO Oral Communication rubric in the Spring 2022 term.

The ILO Social Responsibility rubric was identified as duplicative with the Overlay rubrics. For example, “agency” is a key criteria in Social Responsibility, and is also present in the three Overlay rubrics. Working with the Office of Community Engagement and the EEC, a separate assessment of ILO Social Responsibility was not included in the 2022-2028 ILO Long term Assessment Schedule that has been submitted to faculty governance committees for adoption of a new ILO Long term Assessment cycle.

The CCAG, GE, and additional faculty and co-curricular groups will work with the Sustainability and the other Overlays (Social Justice, Diversity) going forward. Part of this work will be to streamline and better align the rubric, outcomes, and the approach to assessment. Core competencies have historically been (and continue to be) embedded throughout students’ university learning experiences, Sustainability, Social Justice, and Diversity have a single course breadth requirement. While knowledge and skills in these areas are provided in additional curricular and co-curricular experiences, assessment methods will be examined (e.g. surveys) to identify a more meaningful approach to address the limitations of assessment of student learning in a single assignment for “Overlay” courses.

Institutional Effectiveness and Research (IER)

Summary of discussion:

Institutional Effectiveness and Research (IER) has previously supported ILO assessment by compiling assessment results on excel spreadsheets and distributing those results via email to members of the EEC committee. This previous iteration of disseminating data was inefficient for users to easily access and benchmark data across multiple courses and easily compare outcomes across equity indicators (e.g., URM, Pell, First Gen). Spreadsheets also did not allow dynamic interaction of ILO variables, which made conversations related to follow-up actions and closing the loop more difficult. IER determined that visualizing ILO data through the development of Tableau dashboards with explicit reference lines and boxes for equity outcomes would help spark further conversation and provide a centralized/consistent means that EEC members could access data.

Assessment of ILOs has also not traditionally integrated the contributions of co-curricular programs at Cal State East Bay, either, despite the priorities for student affairs functional areas to support academic success. Although co-curricular areas do not follow the same assessment schedule and do not necessarily align all their outcomes to ILOs, IER has started to initiate conversations with student affairs to identify appropriate closing-the-loop activities that directly support academic outcomes.

Summary of actions proposed/implemented:

A suite of dashboards was developed for current ILO assessments starting in Fall 2021. These dashboards are hosted on the Pioneer Insights server and include interactive data related to high-level assessment outcomes, equity indicators, individual course outcomes, and interrater reliability. These dashboards enable a higher level of user interactivity and are designed to compel conversations about actions that can be taken to reduce equity gaps and more easily identify the courses that require corrective action. A member of the IER team now

attends EEC closing the loop meetings and assists in the facilitation of conversations and assessments at the college level.

IER has also identified a cohort of co-curricular support areas during the '21-'22 academic year that includes housing, recreation and wellness, student conduct, ASI, and veteran student services. IER's work with these areas include establishing assessment plans with measurable student success outcomes (e.g., reducing equity gaps, reducing academic probation, increasing retention, etc.). While work remains to build a true bridge to inform academic assessment results, initial actions proposed by student affairs to support closing-the-loop activities related to educational effectiveness include increased interventions for students who receive WUs in courses, examining the presence of racial bias within academic student misconduct, and providing increased basic needs support for students with low academic outcomes. Ultimately, part of the vision of co-curricular assessment is to better establish a connection to ILO assessments results and facilitate collaborative conversations about how academic affairs and student affairs can collectively enhance student learning through this partnership.

Campus Sustainability Committee

Summary of discussion: In Fall 2021, the results from the ILO study of 12 courses with the sustainability overlay were presented to the Committee on Sustainability. Although students in some courses met the competency mark of 15/20 on the student papers assessed by ILO, many had not. In response, the Committee on Sustainability developed several approaches to increase faculty awareness of how to better address all areas of the rubric used to evaluate sustainability overlay and developed some ideas on how to help students directly in their sustainability overlay course work.

Summary of actions proposed/implemented: The Committee on Sustainability hopes to foster communication and development of expertise in faculty teaching courses with the sustainability overlay through our panel presentation, ongoing discussions, training, and resource guides. The Committee is currently recruiting faculty to be part of a panel presentation on pedagogical approaches to teaching sustainability overlay courses which will take place during Earth Week in the Spring of 2022. The program is still in the planning stages, but we will be advertising the presentation to faculty who currently teach overlay courses and to the campus community in general, including faculty who may be considering developing an overlay course. We will use this opportunity to share the assignment guide for sustainability courses in addition to providing a platform for the faculty who are experts in the field and have innovative approaches to sustainability pedagogy. This panel will be recorded and made available to faculty unable to attend. The committee feels that this will bring interested faculty together and result in good discussions about how to improve pedagogy and better address the sustainability learning outcomes. We further hope to create synergies between faculty and ongoing conversations in this area.

Additionally, the committee is developing web guides which will link to important resources including the assignment guide, but also content information in the field of sustainability which addresses both scientific content related to sustainability and social justice related information that addresses the social science elements of our learning outcomes. We saw from the ILO study results that the learning outcomes require that science faculty teach social science and that faculty in the social science and humanities teach science, so we

are specifically designing these resources to bridge what may be a difficult gap for some faculty. We hope to increase the knowledge and competency of the faculty so that they will have resources on content and pedagogy to draw from across disciplines that they may be less familiar with. We also plan to explore the possibility of developing a faculty learning community for faculty developing or revising courses for the sustainability overlay.