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FROM THE EDITOR

Assessing Students’ Diversity, Global, and Civic Learning Gains

“What do we know about students’ learning, and how do we know it?” Presenting this question fifteen years ago to an audience of college and university educators, K. Patricia Cross expressed concern about an apparent disconnect between the burgeoning field of higher education research and the practice of teaching. In Cross’s estimation, higher education research often yielded generalizable findings that, while useful, were most applicable when combined with the personalized knowledge that comes from interacting with individual students. And yet, Cross observed, such connections between the general and the particular were all too rare. “At present,” she noted, “I think we are prone to consider research findings as the conclusion of our investigations into learning. We might do better to think of them as the start of our investigations” (2005, 12).

Replace the word “research” in the previous sentence with the word “assessment,” and an equally valid point emerges. Indeed, the current burst of interest in assessment practices is arguably driven by the need to answer questions similar to the one that anchored Cross’s 1998 address. What do we know about student learning, and how do we know it? Many assessment approaches, from tests to surveys to rubrics, are designed to answer that question as it relates to student learning outcomes. When interpreted carefully, evidence of these outcomes, gathered directly from student work or indirectly from students’ self-reports, tells a story about effective teaching and effective learning. But this story, like the research Cross references, does not and should not conclude neatly. Instead, it should initiate a process to improve higher education and ensure that graduates have the skills, knowledge, and capacities they need to succeed in and contribute to a twenty-first-century world.

In many cases, the skills, knowledge, and capacities students need call for opportunities to engage in civic, global, and intercultural learning. Indeed, in its list of Essential Learning Outcomes, the Association of American Colleges and Universities specifically names civic knowledge and engagement—local and global—and intercultural knowledge and competence as necessary for today’s students (Association of American Colleges and Universities 2013). But what do we know about students’ learning in these areas, and how do we know it? Are students who engage in civic, global, and intercultural learning opportunities actually achieving the intended outcomes? What is the evidence of that achievement? And what does that evidence tell us about the learning process and about how we can best improve it?

This issue of Diversity & Democracy offers a pathway toward engaging with these questions in the realms of civic learning and democratic engagement, global learning, and engagement with diversity. Contributing authors describe different approaches to assessing learning in these areas. Some offer ways to gather authentic evidence of student learning through real engagement with students and their work. Others share what the evidence they have collected has shown about specific educational environments or pedagogical approaches and their effects on student learning. Still others argue for holistic models of assessment that link institutional structures with student learning, or community outcomes with learning outcomes. Whether sharing their own assessment processes or presenting research findings, these authors invite readers to apply lessons learned and bridge the general and particular as they launch and refine their own assessment practices.

To conclude this introduction with another variation on Cross’s provocative question: Why do we assess what we assess about student learning? The answers certainly vary. Many undertake assessments in response to external pressures for accountability, to demonstrate the value of their work to students, parents, administrators, colleagues, or national and international stakeholders. This motivation is certainly valid, especially in the contested realms of civic, global, and diversity work. But in an ideal world, assessment approaches not only provide necessary evidence of effectiveness, but also offer a basis for beginning a new cycle of improvement to advance teaching and learning—a cycle designed to support students’ ability to contribute to and thrive in a democratic society and a diverse and interconnected world.

—KATHRYN PELTIER CAMPBELL, editor of Diversity & Democracy
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Assessing Diversity, Global, and Civic Learning: A Means to Change in Higher Education

Although pedagogies and programs focused on diversity, global, and civic learning are not new in higher education, their salience is increasing, and they are likely to continue growing and becoming more coordinated and integrated as the academy faces unprecedented demographic and social change. This issue of Diversity & Democracy adds an important perspective to these developments. Assessment of student outcomes (that is, knowledge, skills, and attitudes) and related outcomes (for example, community outcomes and campus climate) in these three domains—within and across courses, programs, and institutions—poses both daunting challenges and intriguing possibilities. In this essay, we suggest questions for faculty and administrators to pose in considering approaches to assessment, and we explore the role of assessment as a catalyst for institutional transformation.

Established Assessment Issues

Assessment in higher education has grown significantly in recent decades. Institutions are allocating more resources, adding professional staff, and enhancing techniques; in addition, accreditors and the public are calling for both improvement and accountability. These developments have helped provide evidence-based feedback to improve teaching and learning and advance program and institutional goals, but they have also been marked by underlying tensions. Reflecting on four common points of tension, we offer questions for practitioners to pose of any assessment strategy.

Is the assessment both practical and meaningful? Although self-reports are relatively inexpensive and efficient, approaches that focus on assessing products or behaviors typically involve greater investments in time, professional staff, and course management systems. Gathering authentic evidence of learning may, therefore, pose a variety of costs, especially if infrastructure and human resources are required. Participants at all levels of the assessment process need to consider costs and benefits in light of the short- and long-term purposes and outcomes of the process. Professional development that helps educators integrate diversity, global, and civic learning with other learning goals and embeds associated assessment in courses may enhance both efficiency and effectiveness over time.

Do the assessment procedures support multiple levels of analysis, and what is distinctive at each level? Robust assessment can provide information that is relevant at multiple levels: individual student outcomes (e.g., competencies on course learning goals), metacourse analysis (e.g., cumulative learning across courses), institutional analysis (e.g., information required for accreditation), and cross-institutional comparisons (e.g., data for benchmarking or rankings). For example,
through the application of common rubrics to problem-solving narratives assigned in first-year and capstone courses, an institution can gather evidence—useful at many levels—about how well students understand the sources and significance of cultural and political differences or about their level of critical thinking skills. Integrated frameworks, such as Lumina Foundation’s Degree Qualifications Profile, can help structure assessment that serves distinct purposes at each level while contributing to a cumulative, cross-level evidence base.

Is the assessment theoretically grounded and generalizable to other contexts? Any assessment procedure rests on a set of assumptions—sometimes implicit—about the nature of a content domain, the purpose of instructional or programmatic interventions, and the intended learning outcomes. Battistoni’s (2002) discipline-linked frameworks for civic learning and Deardorff’s (2006) model of intercultural competence are two examples of frameworks related to the domains of diversity, global, and civic learning that can help practitioners make those assumptions explicit and coherent. Such frameworks and theories elevate assessment activities so that they not only evaluate particular programs but also contribute to a generalizable knowledge base. Through collaborative, scholarly approaches, practitioners can mobilize appropriate theory to inform assessment in the diversity, global, and civic domains while also using assessment to refine and generate theory.

Emerging Assessment Issues
Beyond these four established areas, assessment of diversity, global, and civic learning in particular highlights considerations that can enhance approaches to assessment more generally. Diversity, global, and civic learning may well be most powerfully cultivated in academically-grounded experiential learning contexts—giving rise to three additional questions.

Whose voices and perspectives are included in the assessment process? Diversity, global, and civic learning can ensure that assessment is shaped by and is useful to multiple constituencies within and beyond the academy.

Does the assessment approach align with the nature of the learning process? In academically-based experiential education, critical reflection on experience—not experience alone—both generates learning and provides evidence of learning. Faculty may encourage students to use course concepts as lenses through which to examine their experiences, challenging and deepening their knowledge, skills, and dispositions in various domains of learning. Such an approach integrates critical reflection and assessment to generate, deepen, and document learning. As an example of facilitating and assessing integrative learning and coconstruction of knowledge, this approach has widespread implications that extend beyond experiential education pedagogies or learning in these three domains (Ash and Clayton 2009).

Does the assessment process integrate all relevant learning contexts? Experiential education, which is well-suited to cultivating diversity, global, and civic learning, often involves out-of-classroom academic activities. These cocurricular contexts may lack the structures and norms of course-embedded assessment, and educators may have little experience collaborating across curricular and cocurricular settings or with partners beyond higher education to conceptualize learning goals, design assessment procedures, or interpret evidence. In the diversity, global, and civic domains, higher-order learning may depend on multiple, iterative opportunities for students to reflect critically on their experiences. Insofar as such learning is transformative in nature, it may develop over extended periods of time, across multiple courses, and in a variety of contexts. Assessing such learning in a significant way may therefore require developmentally
designed and integrated strategies that depend on collaboration across multiple teaching and assessment contexts—a welcome deepening and broadening of traditional assessment practices.

**Catalyzing Institutional Change**
Assessment of diversity, global, and civic learning holds the potential not only to enhance assessment practices more generally, but also to catalyze institutional change in higher education. To date, pedagogies and programs focused on learning in these domains have been somewhat peripheral in the academy, amounting to what Cuban (1988) describes as “first-order change” in that they have largely failed to alter the fundamental cultures or organizational features of colleges and universities. However, these initiatives may eventually evoke second-order change—change that transforms the purposes, policies, identities, structures, and operations of institutions. In the realm of assessment, second-order change would mean much more than adding learning objectives to a syllabus or incorporating additional items into established assessment instruments and procedures. Rather, it would involve altering the assumptions and norms that underlie how institutions conceive of and approach not only assessment itself, but also teaching, learning, scholarship, partnerships, and engagement.

The imperative for institutional change in these areas is growing more urgent as the population of the United States becomes more diverse; global interdependency demands greater developed the capacities to continue it throughout their lives. We need to know now how best to integrate learning across diversity, global, civic, and other domains, and we need to know how to leverage pedagogical designs focused on integrative learning for broader and deeper institutional change. The scholarly attention increasingly paid to high-impact pedagogies can provide a vibrant context for such inquiry into teaching and learning, contributing to a knowledge base and informing institutional transformation that is so timely yet so challenging.

One key challenge facing higher education institutions as they reconsider their core purposes is the relationship between education for economic (career) and for civic (citizenship) purposes. Colleges and universities certainly stimulate economic development by teaching job-related knowledge and skills; but a focus on private gain (credentialing for employment) may displace public good (educating for citizenship) as the primary raison d’être of the academy—to the detriment of our students, our communities, and our democracy. By collaboratively conceptualizing and developing the means to integrate and then assess diversity, global, and civic learning, practitioners may contribute new insights into the connections between learning for work and learning for citizenship. By generating and assessing learning across these three domains, colleges and universities committed to nurturing the development of civic-minded graduates and professionals may advance second-order institutional transformation.

Work on assessing diversity, global, and civic learning—and especially their integration—promises to inform higher education’s understanding not only of graduates’ knowledge, skills, dispositions, perspectives, and identities, but also of what higher education institutions should become. We applaud those who have initiated inquiry in these areas, and we challenge colleagues throughout and beyond the academy to continue this important work.
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Teaching and learning models informed by social justice education have described how diversity is embedded in who we teach, who teaches, what is taught, and how it is taught (see Jackson 1988; Marchesani and Adams 1992). In the Multi-Contextual Model for Diverse Learning Environments developed by Hurtado et al. (2012a), students’ multiple social identities are at the center of curricular and cocurricular spheres, where they exist in dynamic relationship with faculty and staff identities through practices involving both content (or educational programming) and process (pedagogies and forms of practice). To help practitioners understand how such a model might operate on their campuses, researchers at the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) devised the Diverse Learning Environments (DLE) survey. For institutions seeking to learn more about faculty identity, values, and behaviors, the HERI Faculty Survey provides a way to collect information about campus diversity and its relationship to student learning and success.

In this article, we provide evidence from the 2010–11 Diverse Learning Environments survey and the 2010–11 HERI Faculty Survey to illustrate three key points: (1) the relationship between an inclusive curriculum and academic validation as experienced by students, (2) the link between faculty identity and goals for undergraduate education that shape the learning environment, and (3) the connection between faculty diversity and academic validation among diverse students. These data begin to show how inclusive learning environments—defined both by the diversity of who is represented in the learning environment, and by the practice of incorporating diversity into teaching and learning—can be central to empowering students as learners.

The Impact of an Inclusive Curriculum
What is the impact of integrating diversity content into the curriculum and shifting pedagogy to include engagement with diverse peers and communities? Our research indicates that these practices have distinct benefits. DLE findings from 2010–11 show that both course content that addresses diversity and specific pedagogies that encourage engagement with diversity tend to enhance levels of student academic validation.

A concept originating in transformative teaching and counseling as a way of theorizing how students may find success, academic validation involves faculty actions in the classroom that foster students’ academic development (Rendón Linares and Muñoz 2011). The DLE survey measures academic validation in terms of how frequently students experienced the following: “instructors were able to determine my level of understanding of the course material,” “instructors provided me with feedback that helped me judge my progress,” “I feel like my contributions were valued in class,” “instructors encouraged me to ask questions and participate in class discussions,” and “instructors showed concern about my progress.” These items form a scale that campuses can use to gauge students’ levels of academic validation, which has been linked to student re-enrollment in initial studies focused on community colleges (Barnett 2011) and four-year broad-access institutions (Pryor, Hurtado, and Ruiz Alvarado 2013).

As figure 1 shows, the mean level of students’ academic validation scores is higher on the scale with more courses taken in college that include specific content such as materials/readings about privilege, race/ethnicity, or gender. Figure 2 shows a similarly positive association between students’ academic validation and the number of courses taken that included service learning or opportunities for intensive dialogue between students of different backgrounds. Such pedagogy and course content resonate with students’ identities and help students feel valued and affirmed as learners.

The Impact of Faculty Diversity
The course content and pedagogies described above bear an implicit relationship to particular goals for student learning. Faculty may infuse such content and practices into their courses with the aim of increasing students’ engagement with and appreciation for diversity. But is there a relationship between faculty diversity and the goals that may lead to these practices?

Drawing from the Faculty Survey, figure 3 shows how a selected set of goals for undergraduate education differs by faculty race/ethnicity. These goals translate into actual classroom practices or preferences for teaching courses that address diversity and service to the community. For the most part, national data show that the majority of faculty support diversity goals (Hurtado et al. 2012b), but
the HERI faculty survey indicates that among instructors who teach general education courses, underrepresented minority (URM) faculty and white faculty place different emphasis on goals related to citizenship in a multicultural democracy. In addition, fewer faculty from both groups rate as “essential” engaging students in civil discourse around controversial issues—a skill that is critical in a democracy that thrives on difference. Further work is needed to increase faculty skills with managing conflict and discussion of controversial issues in the classroom. All of these diversity values are tied not only to identity, but also to faculty training and academic discipline, all factors that can be explored further using the comprehensive HERI Faculty Survey on work/life experiences.

The question remains: does a diverse faculty result in practices that support student academic validation? Although answering that question would require a more complex analysis than we can provide here, evidence from student surveys begins to illuminate the relationship between faculty diversity and student success. Figure 4 shows the percentage of URM faculty (calculated using data from the US Department of Education’s Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, or IPEDS) at institutions that administered the DLE in 2010–11. Indeed, there is a positive relationship between faculty diversity and the extent to which students reported academic validation.

Using Surveys to Improve Climate and Learning
While there is much research supporting the importance of diverse peers in relation to a wide range of learning outcomes, there is less on the formal conditions that help structure opportunities to learn among diverse peers. An inclusive curriculum, a diverse faculty, and practices that make the most of interactions among a diverse student body are all factors linked with learning. This article provides just a few key examples of how diversity in the faculty and curriculum may affect how students begin to feel competent, adopt feelings of self-worth, and become active agents in their own learning.

Administered annually, the DLE survey addresses many issues related to institutional climate experienced by members of different identity groups, institutional practices, student outcomes related to retention and achievement, civic competencies, and habits of mind for lifelong learning. While most institutions have used the survey to address difficult issues related to campus climate, we also encourage campuses to use the instrument to examine issues associated with student success. Institutions should link DLE data with student transcripts, enrollment data, or data from the National Student Clearinghouse to study retention, enrollment mobility, and achievement. Provided they focus on collecting adequate responses from underrepresented and nontraditional students, institutions can use the survey to gain information about these students’ experiences and needs.

The Faculty Survey is administered triennially, and the 2013–14...
administration will remain open for registration until May 2014. The survey addresses many issues related to faculty work and life experiences that also affect teaching, research, and service activity. This year, we have expanded the general survey with additional items on teaching and have added modules to tap into campus climate; science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) teaching and learning; student advising; spirituality; and identity items, including LGBTQ identity. As with the DLE survey, campuses can choose to administer the general Faculty Survey with or without any of the modules, and also can add a limited set of locally developed survey items.

**Conclusion**

Our research suggests that introducing diversity into the higher education workforce and into teaching and learning processes is important wherever improving student success is a priority. By teaching and designing inclusive educational programs, faculty and staff who value diversity and know how to work with diverse students will provide the necessary scaffolding for student success. Institutions can use the surveys described above to gather the information necessary to engage in practical self-assessment that puts students and their success at the center of higher education. While improving the success of diverse students and the assessment of their learning outcomes is important, so is taking stock of key institutional features that shape the learning environment—including faculty diversity and practices that use diversity as an asset in teaching and learning processes.

To learn more about or register for HERI surveys, or to learn about HERI’s Diversity Research Institute and its Retention and Persistence Institute, visit www.heri.ucla.edu, or email heri@ucla.edu.

**REFERENCES**


[ASSESSING DIVERSITY, GLOBAL, AND CIVIC LEARNING]

Developing a Global Learning Rubric: Strengthening Teaching and Improving Learning

CHAD ANDERSON, program associate at the Association of American Colleges and Universities
DAVID BLAIR, director of institutional assessment at St. Edward’s University

For over a decade, through its national, multi-project initiative Shared Futures: Global Learning and Social Responsibility, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) has collaborated with and learned from hundreds of campuses working to make high-impact, interdisciplinary, globally-focused learning pervasive across their institutions. Over time, each of these campuses has grappled with versions of the following questions:

1. What is global learning, and how can our institution build consensus around it?
2. What are the outcomes of global learning, and what knowledge, skills, and capacities are needed to ensure that students achieve those outcomes?
3. Is our institution effectively infusing global learning into the curriculum and cocurriculum?
4. Are our students successfully acquiring the aforementioned knowledge, skills, and capacities?

The Global Learning VALUE Rubric offers a common language and some foundational stepping stones to help campus practitioners answer these questions and address the challenges related to defining, mapping, implementing, and assessing global learning outcomes.

Background

In 2011, the Shared Futures initiative’s latest project, General Education for a Global Century (funded by the Henry Luce Foundation), gathered campus teams from thirty-two diverse colleges and universities at a summer institute to help develop a national agenda for aligning general education curricula with expectations for educating students for socially responsible and globally engaged leadership. Project participants, along with AAC&U staff, concluded that a global learning rubric would be a useful resource for initiating reflection and conversation on campus, garnering faculty and administrator buy-in, and building both common language and institutional capacity for global learning. As a result of that institute, a subcommittee of fourteen faculty, administrators, and assessment scholars—representing a variety of disciplines and institutional types—convened in September 2011 to develop such a tool.

The rubric development committee generally followed a process previously used by AAC&U’s Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) project (see Morgaine 2010). To begin, each committee member submitted a list of global learning outcomes they felt were essential for graduates to possess. Through months-long deliberation, the committee whittled down the resulting list to six dimensions (AAC&U 2013):

- Global Self-Awareness
- Perspective Taking
- Cultural Diversity
- Personal and Social Responsibility
- Understanding Global Systems
- Applying Knowledge to Contemporary Global Contexts

For each dimension, the committee identified a set of criteria corresponding to levels one to four (see table 1 for an example).

Like all of AAC&U’s VALUE rubrics, the Global Learning Rubric is meant to be read from left to right, starting at level four (capstone) and ending at level one (benchmark). This design encourages faculty to begin by picturing the highest level of student learning within a certain outcome before envisioning lower levels of achievement. Moreover, the Global Learning VALUE Rubric (like all VALUE rubrics) ends at level one rather than zero in order to emphasize positive capacities instead of negative deficiencies. The rubric thus underscores what should be present in students’ work rather than what may currently exist.

To this end, level four captures what faculty members representing a variety of academic disciplines, campus roles, institutional types, enrollment sizes, and geographic regions describe as their highest aspirational goals for graduates and alumni, often inspired and embodied by their most exemplary students. While many students may not reach this level, faculty and other campus professionals should be cognizant of the language used to describe it so they can articulate expectations to students and identify cases where student work embodies level-four achievement. In contrast, level one captures what a wide range of faculty members describe as the average capabilities of their first-year students (although student work completed in any academic year could land anywhere along the rubric’s levels). While the rubric does not explicitly include a level zero, that level still implicitly exists for student work that does not reach the minimal benchmark.

Campus Calibration

From June 2012 to March 2013, the rubric underwent four nationwide evaluation cycles, each followed by extensive revisions. The volunteer evaluators—over one hundred people representing sixty-two higher education institutions and associations across the country—tested the rubric’s clarity and usability using...
student work. Several groups of faculty, both on campuses and at AAC&U’s General Education and Assessment Conference (working with the assistance of Teagle scholars), helped calibrate the rubric (see sidebar) and establish inter-rater reliability.

St. Edward’s University was one institution that participated in the rubric design and pilot process. Faculty and administrators at St. Edward’s had previously completed an inventory of the institution’s strengths and gaps in its global learning programming, which prepared them to consider which parts of the rubric applied to their campus needs, goals, and definition of global learning. The team at St. Edward’s used the pilot instrument to assess student learning demonstrated through samples of student work from courses specifically designed to encourage global learning. Information gathered from these sessions prompted faculty to revise a reflective essay assignment required of students enrolled in the Workshop for Global Understanding to better assess where third-year students are in terms of institutional global learning goals.

Armed with assessment data from this project, faculty and other practitioners at St. Edward’s plan to integrate the rubric into other globally focused courses in the coming year. As a result of their participation, they have developed a deeper appreciation for the evolutionary nature of global learning and a clearer understanding of how students can move at different speeds toward increasingly sophisticated comprehension of global issues, social justice, and their own identities in relation to the world.

Faculty and administrators at Michigan State University (MSU) offer another example of how participating campuses have learned from the rubric development project. At MSU, faculty evaluated the pilot Global Learning VALUE Rubric as part of the Center for Integrative Studies in General Science’s spring 2012 Faculty Learning Community (FLC). Many FLC participants had not used or developed rubrics before, and the FLC’s rubric evaluation exercise provided participants the tools to craft and use rubrics in their own courses and offered them a deeper understanding of how rubrics can assess and improve pedagogical and curricular effectiveness. This professional development opportunity fostered and strengthened faculty community-building across departments and disciplines (Jardeleza et al. 2013).

Participating MSU faculty reported implementing new pedagogies as a result of the rubric evaluation exercise. For example, one faculty member asked students to analyze two comparable environmental issues, one local and one abroad, and examine potential solutions in their respective contexts. After completing this exercise—which the instructor had designed to align with the pilot rubric’s six dimensions—students used the rubric to identify the assignment’s learning outcomes and indicate the outcome levels at which they saw themselves. This self-reflective exercise allowed students to actively engage in their learning by offering them a framework for describing and concretizing their global perspective. It also provided them an aspirational goalpost for which to strive in their academic, professional, and personal lives (Jardeleza et al. 2013).

### Recommended Use

The tool resulting from the pilot evaluation process uses the six dimensions identified by the rubric committee to measure how well curricular and cocurricular programming equips students with the knowledge, skills, and values to address real-world, global challenges. These dimensions make the most sense when understood as programmatic outcomes, and the rubric encourages institutions to construct a curriculum that will lead to these outcomes (or to modified ones that are essential to institutional goals). The Global Learning VALUE Rubric is particularly effective for measuring students’ progress over time—for example, for measuring learning demonstrated through students’ e-portfolios. While faculty can use the rubric in the classroom, they should be prepared to craft assignments and syllabi

### TABLE 1. Understanding Global Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSION</th>
<th>Capstone (4)</th>
<th>Milestones (3)</th>
<th>Benchmark (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding Global Systems</td>
<td>Uses deep knowledge of the historic and contemporary role and differential effects of human organizations and actions on global systems to develop and advocate for informed, appropriate action to solve complex problems in the human and natural worlds.</td>
<td>Analyzes major elements of global systems, including their historic and contemporary interconnections and the differential effects of human organizations and actions, to pose elementary solutions to complex problems in the human and natural worlds.</td>
<td>Examines the historical and contemporary roles, interconnections, and differential effects of human organizations and actions on global systems within the human and the natural worlds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identifies the basic role of some global and local institutions, ideas, and processes in the human and natural worlds.
that intentionally address each of the rubric outcomes.

AAC&U encourages campuses not only to adapt and revise the VALUE rubrics to best fit their particular contexts and goals, but also to use the rubrics as guides for reflection about current practices and for inventorying their curricular programs’ strengths and gaps. For example, the Global Learning VALUE Rubric suggests student action as a desired outcome of global learning. If a faculty member’s current pedagogy does not require this outcome, the rubric might prompt the faculty member to consider the steps and resources needed to develop a curriculum that does engage students in meaningful action. Of course, campus context is important: faculty members must think about what action is possible, both within the confines of their courses or programs and at their students’ current stages of development. But giving students access to high-impact learning opportunities encourages them to apply knowledge, to challenge themselves, and to foster their own capacities to initiate change.

Conclusion

Whether adapting any of the VALUE rubrics or developing their own, campus professionals will find themselves on a long, winding passage through unfamiliar territory. They will have to identify and narrow a list of key learning outcomes; draft and redraft definitions, descriptors, and levels; navigate the conflicting perspectives of colleagues; and compromise without losing the rubric’s original intent.

No matter how challenging or slow, the journey of developing a rubric leads to a rewarding and tangible, albeit sometimes imperfect, end: the ability to help strengthen how faculty teach and how students learn. The big questions of our time—climate change, human rights, technological advancement, and economic globalization, to name a few—require the next generation to think critically, creatively, and collaboratively and to take responsible action to address challenges that are, and have always been, global in nature. The Global Learning VALUE Rubric is the result of one group’s ambitious vision and best effort to equip faculty and students with a map to embark on their own journeys, wherever they might lead.

To download the Global Learning Rubric and other VALUE rubrics, please visit http://www.aacu.org/value/index.cfm.

The members of the Global Learning VALUE Rubric Development Committee include Chad Anderson (AAC&U), David Blair (St. Edward’s University), Karla Davis-Salazar (University of South Florida), Sarah Fatherly (Queens University of Charlotte), Ashley Finley (AAC&U), Wende Garrison (Virginia Tech), Eleanor Hall (AAC&U), Ranae Hanson (Minneapolis Community and Technical College), Bruce Keith (United States Military Academy), Andrew Lloyd (Delaware State University), James Lucas (Michigan State University), Katherine McConnell (Virginia Tech), Caryn McGtige Musil (AAC&U), Janet L. S. Moore (University of South Florida), Patricia Mosto (Rider University), Christina Sanchez (University of North Carolina at Charlotte), and Nicholas Santilli (Notre Dame College).

The authors would like to acknowledge Ashley Finley for her contributions to this article.
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Tips for Calibrating Rubrics

Before reviewing student work, it is advisable to calibrate the rubric through an interactive group session. In this session,

1. Facilitators should encourage participants to think comprehensively about the curriculum, student work, and learning skills and to look beyond specific disciplines or content.

2. Once participants have familiarized themselves with the rubric’s glossary, structure, language, and performance levels, the group should address any questions about how to interpret general and specific criteria.

3. After this preliminary discussion, the group should complete a practice round in which participants read and score a sample of student work.

4. Participants should review and discuss the scores one level and one dimension at a time. Each participant should describe how they scored the work, citing specific evidence from the work sample to support their reasoning.

5. Finally, the group should determine the average or common score for the sample in question based on scorers’ choices. It is important to note that consensus is not necessary; a general understanding about how the group will interpret the rubric is sufficient.

After taking these steps to calibrate the rubric, participants are ready to begin scoring student work.

—Chad Anderson and David Blair

Adapted with permission from Finley (n.d.)
Working across Institutions to Define and Assess Civic Learning

**CHRISTOPHER CRATSLEY,** director of assessment at Fitchburg State University

**RUTH C. SLOTNICK,** director of articulation and learning assessment at Mount Wachusett Community College

In December 2012, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts reaffirmed its historical commitment to civic engagement and learning with a report titled *Renewing the Social Compact*. Written by the commonwealth’s newly formed Special Commission on Civic Engagement and Learning, the report supported the recent actions of the state’s Board of Higher Education, which in September 2012 named civic education and engagement as the sixth goal of the state’s Vision Project—an effort to improve student learning and achievement, college participation, degree production, and workforce development, with a special focus on college completion for low-income and racial and ethnic minority groups. For the state’s higher education institutions, the Vision Project and the *Renewing the Social Compact* report served as catalysts for reexamining academic programs and campus goals related to civic engagement.

The renewed emphasis on civic learning validated an effort already in progress at Fitchburg State University and Mount Wachusett Community College (MWCC). Since March 2012, the two institutions have been collaborating through the Association of American Colleges and Universities’ (AAC&U’s) Quality Collaboratives (QC), a three-year project supported by Lumina Foundation and the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation. The QC project pairs dyads of two- and four-year institutions in nine states to develop recommended policies for assessing and reporting student achievement and related transfer designs, using both Lumina Foundation’s Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP) and AAC&U’s Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) Essential Learning Outcomes as guides. The Fitchburg State–MWCC dyad has developed teams around four competencies: civic engagement, written communication, information literacy, and quantitative reasoning. The civic engagement team is facing one of the project’s more challenging and critical tasks: reconciling two different institutional approaches to assessment within the broader context of a state-level commitment to civic education and engagement.

**Institutional Contexts**

Both Mount Wachusett Community College and Fitchburg State University entered the QC project with longstanding commitments to civic priorities.

For over a decade, MWCC has supported civic learning collaborations and community partnerships within the Gardner, Massachusetts, area. Through the Center for Civic Learning and Community Engagement (endowed in 2012), MWCC staff assist with program development and design, faculty and student support, strategic community collaborations, data collection and evaluation, and assessment of high-impact practices and programs. Service learning, one of the college’s most treasured assets, occurs in nearly fifty courses, engaging more than forty instructors and over four hundred students each year. Some majors require service-learning internships, involving over one hundred students annually in hands-on experiences that benefit the community. Beginning in fall 2012, students majoring in general studies will enroll in a required service-learning capstone course. The college also participates with Fitchburg State in AmeriCorps Job Ready, engaging over ten thousand community members annually in job preparedness training and workshops, and in the United Way Youth Venture program, which involves over two thousand high school students per year in developing their own social entrepreneurial opportunities. The college is one of ten Massachusetts community colleges holding Carnegie classification in Curricular Engagement and Outreach Partnerships.

Fitchburg State University has also expressed its longstanding institutional commitment to civic education and engagement, including through its institutional mission of fostering students’ civic and global responsibility. Identifying citizenship as one of five central learning objectives for all students, the campus liberal arts and sciences curriculum is designed to ensure that students will articulate the relationships among local, national, and global concerns and recognize opportunities to enact positive change. The Douglas and Isabelle Crocker Center for Civic Engagement, founded in 2007, has expanded the commitment to community by promoting engaged scholarship for students and faculty. Eight recent faculty-driven civic engagement projects have enlisted over one hundred students in community work, and over three hundred attendees have engaged in ten public workshops. The center has established resource-sharing and service-learning partnerships with organizations in areas from public safety to community outreach.

**Developing a Work Plan**

After joining the QC project in spring 2012, project directors from MWCC (Ruth Slotnick) and Fitchburg State (Christopher Cratsley) recruited and assembled four teams of faculty and...
staff leaders. Each team consisted of eight paid “assessment scholars” (three faculty members and one staff member from each institution), one of whom was named team leader. The teams focused on four areas—civic engagement, communication literacy, quantitative literacy, and information literacy—that represent priorities shared between the two institutions and reflected in both the DQP and the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes. The project goal was to develop and implement assessment plans in these areas and generate recommendations for using the resulting data to inform transfer decisions.

In June 2012, project participants gathered for a two-day institute where they analyzed each institution’s rubrics, aligned these rubrics with LEAP and DQP learning outcomes, and developed a work plan for the upcoming year. At this meeting, the civic engagement team received copies of the DQP, AAC&U’s Civic Engagement VALUE (Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education) Rubric, the MWCC Understanding Self Survey, the Fitchburg State Citizenship through Critical Analysis of Events Rubric, and a blank timeline for the upcoming year. The teams established a Blackboard site with wikis and blogs, scheduled monthly meetings beginning in September, and established work plans to collect and assess samples of student work.

In October 2012, the dyad held an all-project workshop where Susan Albertine, vice president for diversity, equity, and student success at AAC&U, described national efforts to improve equity, and student success at AAC&U. Albertine, vice president for diversity, emphasized the critical role faculty play in developing a local philosophy and methodology to assess student learning in relation to transfer. The workshop provided an opportunity for Albertine and project directors Slotnick and Cratsley to help the assessment teams refine their rubrics, identify assignments appropriate for assessing student work, and address concerns about norming rubric scoring between assessors.

**Artifacts and Scoring**

Throughout the fall semester, the civic engagement team modified the Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric by reorganizing and revising some of the criteria. The team identified types of student artifacts that were potential sources of evidence for civic engagement and ruled out types of work that did not provide evidence related to rubric criteria. Having established these parameters, the team agreed to proceed with norming and scoring student work in the hopes that the data generated would prove illuminating.

The teams gathered in a second all-project meeting on January 24, 2013. Prior to this meeting, the project directors uploaded one set of artifacts to the Tk20 online assessment system for each team’s review. Addressing the full group, each team leader presented an overview of the team’s work since the fall all-project meeting and shared the selection of artifacts to be assessed. After the project directors explained how to use the Tk20 system, the teams logged on, reviewed the artifacts, completed any additional norming, and discussed their plans for assessing the artifacts.

Throughout the month of February, the civic engagement team used the Tk20 system to assess images MWCC students had created to represent what the United States Constitution means to them (figure 1). The team also assessed artifacts from Fitchburg State, including reflective essays written by human services students following a semester-long field experience, research papers from the same students on a contemporary issue in human services, and oral history projects created by students who had interviewed community members about an issue in the Fitchburg community.

**FIGURE 1. A Student’s Photographic Representation of Freedom of Religion**

Photo courtesy of Brittany Martinez

The assessment scholars attempted to score each sample of student work using the modified Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric they had developed in the fall (to download the original rubric, visit www.aacu.org/value/). In addition to modifying the rubric criteria, they had revised the rubric to rename the four levels of achievement—mastery, proficiency, emerging, and foundation—and to add two columns: one representing no demonstration of each criterion, and one indicating that the assignment was not appropriate for assessment using a particular criterion. The most telling finding was arguably related to this final category, as a high percentage of scorers rated many criteria as not applicable to the assignment (see table 1). These results, which the project directors aggregated in Tk20 and compiled for the team, suggest that no one type of assignment sampled effectively captured all rubric criteria. Evidence of Analysis of Knowledge and Civic Communication appeared to be the easiest to find across all assignments. Self-reflection assignments showed the most potential for effectively capturing elements like Civic Identity and Reflection as well as Civic Action and Commitment, but provided insight into the Diversity of Communities and Cultures or Involvement in the Community Infrastructure only in certain cases. In these areas, analytical
papers (such as the oral history project reports and human services issues papers) provided additional information, particularly when they focused on local community issues. Finally, images presented without reflection or analysis seem to be poor sources of data for assessing the criteria.

Lessons Learned
In March 2013, the civic engagement team met to review the data and discuss the assessment process. Project directors Cratsley and Slotnick used this meeting to collect qualitative data on faculty and staff perspectives. The team identified a number of important outcomes and established next steps for the project.

The civic engagement team described challenges related to reconciling diverse views of civic education, as represented in institutional assessment approaches at Fitchburg State and MWCC, in the outcomes identified by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in the DQP and the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes, and in the VALUE rubrics. For example, Fitchburg State’s definition of citizenship requires students to recognize opportunities to enact change but does not necessarily require them to act. The institution’s Citizenship through Critical Analysis of Events rubric thus measures only their ability to reflect on diversity and make connections between academic knowledge, civic engagement, and their own civic lives. In contrast, the MWCC Understanding Self rubric asks students to rate their own level of civic engagement in terms of volunteer work and political activity, as well as to rate their civic knowledge, but falls short of measuring civic learning.

Assessment scholars working with the modified Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric found that the student artifacts they collected, while often providing evidence of civic knowledge and civic cognitive skills, were less consistent in providing evidence of civic participatory skills or civic dispositions. They also identified a need to create better alignment between the modified rubric and various civic frameworks. The DQP uses the broad term “civic learning” to describe separate civic outcomes (for example, the ability to explain and describe in ways that reflect civic knowledge and cognitive skills and the ability to provide evidence of active, engaged collaborations that reflect participatory skills). While the original LEAP Essential Learning Outcome—Civic Knowledge and Engagement (Local and Global)—reflects a similar balance between knowledge and active engagement, the Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric focuses heavily on assessing participatory skills and dispositions. Therefore, the team’s goal moving forward is to further revise the rubric to more clearly distinguish between civic knowledge, cognitive and participatory skills, and dispositions, as well as to provide guidelines and sample assignments that better capture the range of civic learning competencies.

Next Steps
In the grant’s final year (2013–14), Fitchburg State University and Mount Wachusett Community College will focus on encouraging cross-disciplinary discussions in high-transfer areas such as business, early childhood education, and liberal arts and sciences. The teams will also create assignment prompts that mirror their adapted VALUE rubrics, with the eventual goal of embedding assignments and curriculum mapping within each institution for program-level benchmarking and cross-institutional comparisons. The civic engagement team’s challenge will be reconciling the DQP’s focus on civic learning with that of the Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric, which stresses participatory skills and civic dispositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of Communities and Cultures</td>
<td>52.6% (20)</td>
<td>44.4% (8)</td>
<td>32.3% (11)</td>
<td>33.3% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Knowledge</td>
<td>34.2% (13)</td>
<td>22.2% (4)</td>
<td>17.6% (6)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Identity and Reflection</td>
<td>65.8% (25)</td>
<td>22.2% (4)</td>
<td>64.7% (22)</td>
<td>33.3% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Communication</td>
<td>47.4% (18)</td>
<td>38.9% (7)</td>
<td>23.5% (8)</td>
<td>16.7% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in the Community Infrastructure</td>
<td>76.3% (29)</td>
<td>44.4% (8)</td>
<td>70.6% (24)</td>
<td>16.7% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Action and Commitment</td>
<td>76.3% (29)</td>
<td>27.8% (5)</td>
<td>70.6% (24)</td>
<td>50% (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Assessing Intercultural Competence

LORAINA PHILLIPS, director of institutional assessment at Texas A&M University
RYAN MCLAWHON, assistant director of institutional assessment at Texas A&M University

Since implementing its International and Cultural Diversity (ICD) requirement in 2002, Texas A&M University has prioritized students’ development of intercultural and global knowledge and competence. Students are required to complete six hours of coursework with an ICD designation, indicating significant content and activities designed to educate a “more pluralistic, diverse and globally aware populace” (Texas A&M University 2012, 19).

To assess student achievement in these areas, Texas A&M’s Office of Institutional Assessment (OIA) asked faculty members teaching the ten most popular ICD courses to submit complete sets of student work that had been assigned with the intention of evaluating students’ social, cultural, and global competence. As a result of this inquiry, the assessment office discovered that faculty in these high-enrollment, lecture-driven courses relied primarily on objective exams to evaluate student performance. Since these exams were not an ideal tool for assessing the nuances of social, cultural, and global competence, the office sought another avenue for harvesting student work.

Based on pilot project findings, Texas A&M launched the Intercultural Competence Project (ICP) in summer 2012.

Developed in 2009 as part of the Academic Master Plan, the university’s Teaching and Learning Roadmap established learning outcomes for undergraduate general education. These learning outcomes align with both the Association of American Colleges and Universities’ (AAC&U’s) Essential Learning Outcomes and the state of Texas’s newly adopted Core Curriculum Objectives, to be implemented in fall 2014. The university specifies that students will “demonstrate social, cultural, and global competence, including the ability to

- live and work effectively in a diverse and global society;
- articulate the value of a diverse and global perspective;
- recognize diverse economic, political, cultural and religious opinions and practices.” (Texas A&M University 2012, 22)

The assessment liaisons decided to use AAC&U’s Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) rubric on Intercultural Knowledge and Competence (Rhodes 2010) to evaluate the papers for evidence of social, cultural, and global competence. This rubric describes four levels of student performance related to a variety of different criteria, including cultural self-awareness, knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks, empathy, communication, curiosity, and openness.

To test the rubric, staff and faculty volunteers met during summer 2011 with the assistant vice president for Global Programs Support, who had extensively studied related assessment literature. During a one-day event, the group calibrated their assessments by discussing their expectations for applying the rubric criteria, identifying an “anchor” paper for each assignment, and scoring those papers together to develop consensus about an approach. Two participants then scored each remaining paper, with a third participant scoring any papers where the first two scores diverged widely. OIA staff calculated interrater agreement scores to identify places where discussion and recalibration might be beneficial. Over the course of the eight-hour workday, each participant scored approximately nine papers. Following the scoring session, scorers participated in a focus group discussion to evaluate the rubric’s usability, its applicability to student work, its calibration and scoring, and the associated workload.

The rubric was well received by participants, who had several recommendations for future administrations. First, the group recommended removing the criterion for “Skills: Verbal and nonverbal communication,” because these skills are difficult to evaluate via written assignments. Next, participants rejected the possibility of establishing a minimum page requirement for papers to be evaluated, since even short papers could...
address all rubric criteria. Participants reinforced the importance of calibrating each individual assignment type before scoring student papers and discussed the need for diversity (of ethnicity, gender, department/college affiliation, etc.) among faculty scorers. The group agreed that the overall workload was acceptable and the time allocated for calibration and scoring was appropriate.

**Intercultural Competence Project**

Based on pilot project findings, Texas A&M launched the Intercultural Competence Project (ICP) in summer 2012. Assessment liaisons extended e-mail invitations to faculty asking for student work dealing with international, global, or diversity issues, and faculty submitted nearly two hundred and fifty papers in response. As in the pilot project, the assessment team redacted personally identifiable information and coded the papers for analysis. For this administration, the team also obtained student demographic information.

The associate dean of diversity in the College of Liberal Arts joined the assistant vice president for Global Programs Support in leading the calibration process. Using a modified version of the rubric that excluded the verbal and nonverbal communication skills criteria, faculty from four different colleges scored the submitted papers.

Following the scoring exercise, OIA staff compared mean scores based on gender, ethnicity, and classification (for example, junior). Although the scores showed no statistically significant differences for gender and ethnicity, seniors scored better on average for each criterion. The OIA created department-level reports for each participating unit, comparing each department's scores to the overall average. These reports should help spark conversation about opportunities to enhance pedagogy and the curriculum.

**Areas for Improvement**

In both the pilot project and the ICP, faculty participants emphasized the importance of seeing the original writing prompt for each group of papers. In future administrations, the OIA will obtain these prompts and summarize them for faculty scorers. Several scorers were uncomfortable assigning scores for particular criteria that faculty members may not have emphasized in the course.

In both administrations, scorers reached the lowest level of agreement about how to score the "Attitudes: Curiosity" section of the rubric, which they found difficult to interpret. The OIA plans to study related assessment theories to provide deeper explanations for this criterion. The lower agreement scores for this section could also have been affected by some scorers' tendency to evaluate students' curiosity in comparison to the perceived curiosity levels of typical Texas A&M students, rather than in direct relationship to the rubric's criteria. Faculty members also disagreed about whether specific actions (for example, studying abroad) conclusively indicated high levels of curiosity.

Future administrations of the ICP will target the eight colleges not included to date. Although the racial composition of the first ICP sample was representative of Texas A&M's student population (approximately 70 percent white), the OIA has also begun identifying strategies to obtain more work by students from underrepresented groups.

With support from the OIA, assessment liaisons will present project results, including processes and methodologies, to college leaders. By including as many stakeholders as possible and adjusting processes according to their feedback, the assessment office aims to yield more relevant and actionable results. Ultimately, the office aims to establish the ICP as one of many measures of student learning designed to inform curricular and pedagogical improvements at Texas A&M.

To institutions considering planning a scoring day using rubrics, we recommend the following steps:

1. Find, gather, and prepare student papers.
2. Recruit subject matter experts as calibrators.
3. Plan paper scoring order with calibrators.
4. Estimate time needed to score assignment types and block day accordingly.
5. Invite scorers.
6. Designate staff to calculate real-time interrater agreement and manage paper distribution.
7. Order food!

—Loraine Phillips and Ryan McLawhon
Considerations of religious, spiritual, and value-based worldviews should be essential to liberal learning. Although higher education has not always prioritized these considerations, any institution can develop and assess a culture of interfaith learning—which includes not only learning about different religions, but also learning about the relationships among them.

Dominican University in suburban Chicago recently completed a third year of partnership with the Interfaith Youth Core (IFYC) to advance interfaith learning. We began our partnership in 2010 by surveying students, faculty, and staff regarding their attitudes and behaviors related to religious identity, diversity, and interfaith cooperation. Task groups also conducted a year-long exercise to map campus assets for interfaith learning across programs, curricula, communications, policies, and mission.

Our resulting analyses led us to establish a permanent oversight committee responsible for developing multiple strategies for infusing religious diversity across the curriculum and core curriculum. The Interfaith Cooperation Committee includes faculty, staff, and students in four working groups (on curriculum development, programs and events, community partnerships, and assessment). As dean of the college of arts and sciences, I cochair the committee with a colleague in university ministry. Based on our efforts, I would recommend the following actions to campuses interested in building and assessing a culture of interfaith learning.

**Interfaith Learning Outcomes at Dominican University**

**Attitudes**
- Demonstrates willingness to respond to questions regarding one's own religious, spiritual, or value-based (RSV) worldview
- Demonstrates willingness to participate in educational or celebratory events of various traditions as appropriate
- Seeks out information and dialogue on various RSV worldviews
- Seeks to establish common ground while acknowledging conflict as it arises

**Knowledge**
- Identifies gaps in one's own knowledge about one's own and others' RSV worldviews and knows how to access resources to increase knowledge
- Identifies key facts and positive facets of multiple RSV-based histories, traditions, and practices, including one's own
- Explains the value of interfaith cooperation and its importance for the Catholic Dominican tradition
- Explains why knowledge about RSV worldviews is important for the students' chosen field of study or future profession
- Critically evaluates the role one's own RSV worldview has played socially, culturally, and historically
- Analyzes the role of religion, spirituality, and value-based worldviews in significant current and historical events

**Skills**
- Communicates in ways that can build relationships and foster dialogue with various others

**Actions**
- Initiates informed and appreciative interfaith dialogue
- Acknowledges mistakes and takes corrective action when one's behavior has harmed another
- Collaborates with others from different RSV worldviews to address contemporary social concerns
Diversity in Courses grants to encourage faculty to incorporate engagement with diversity into coursework where such engagement was low. The next round of grants will focus on religious diversity, and grant recipients will form a learning community that will use a faculty resource guide currently being developed by the Interfaith Cooperation Committee and IFYC.

Address religious diversity through endowed chairs, special lectures, and campus-wide rituals or events. At Dominican, Eboo Patel, founder and president of IFYC, energized our interfaith efforts as a liberal arts and sciences endowed chair in fall 2011. Our cherished Candle and Rose ceremony for graduating seniors now incorporates religiously diverse prayers and student speakers, and our annual daylong Caritas Veritas Symposium, which explores how the work of faculty, staff, and students embodies the Catholic Dominican mission, now opens with multireligious readings and music and includes academic panels exploring religious diversity.

Support new projects that promote interfaith exchange. As a result of a space audit, the Interfaith Cooperation Committee collaborated with the university art gallery to create a juried interfaith art exhibit in a high-traffic location on campus. Saudi students hosted an Eid al-Adha celebration, and Tibetan monks created a mandala in our library as part of annual International Week events. Students hosted an innovative “speedfaithing” session connected with our endowed chair lecture by Eboo Patel. Faculty in business and theology spent a year reading about and discussing Muslim and Christian approaches to economic issues.

What are the opportunities for infusion on your campus?

Develop Learning Outcomes
The Interfaith Cooperation Committee drafted explicit interfaith learning outcomes, appropriate for graduates and undergraduates and for both curricular and cocurricular initiatives (see sidebar). The committee is now sharing these outcomes broadly, inviting different schools and academic departments to adapt them and develop rubrics for their respective areas.

The interfaith learning outcomes provide a basis for pre/post surveys conducted in targeted courses, including some identified through the university-wide curriculum audit. The assessment working group of the Interfaith Cooperation Committee is collaborating with faculty in these courses to conduct direct assessments of student learning based on specific course assignments.

Several units are incorporating interfaith competencies into their disciplinary learning outcomes, including graduate and professional programs that prepare students to work with and serve religiously diverse populations. The assessment working group has also developed and implemented tools for assessing the effectiveness of cocurricular interfaith events.

What would interfaith learning outcomes look like on your campus?

Create Curricular Anchors
The Interfaith Cooperation Committee has worked with faculty teaching Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS) Seminars, a key feature of our undergraduate core curriculum. Students take one integrative seminar each year on a specified topic: The Examined Life (freshman seminar), Life in Community (sophomore seminar), A Life’s Work (junior seminar), and The Good Life (senior seminar). Several of these seminars’ common texts now explicitly emphasize interfaith themes.

In recent years, many students in the first-year seminar have visited a local Buddhist center in conjunction with their course. Students in other courses have collected and delivered refugee welcome packs for religiously diverse, newly-arrived refugees in Chicago. Some faculty are creating experiential learning opportunities linked to relationships developed by the community partnerships working group.

Does your institution have courses that most students take, and can these include interfaith engagement?

An Embedded Approach
Much of Dominican’s work to advance interfaith learning is embedded explicitly in the university’s current reaccreditation process, through which we are measuring our effectiveness in developing “Globally Positioned Students.” Thus, at Dominican, building and assessing a culture of interfaith learning is part and parcel of our institution-wide approach to student learning. The Interfaith Cooperation Committee has created a website to share our interfaith work with the broader community (http://www.dom.edu/interfaith).

When we conduct our curriculum audit again in a few years, we expect to see an increase in the pervasiveness of opportunities for interfaith learning and engagement, and an increase in student learning based on our interfaith outcomes. This is how we are building and assessing a culture of interfaith learning at Dominican University.
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Assessing the Practices of Public Scholarship

MIRIAM BARTHA, associate director of the Simpson Center for the Humanities at the University of Washington

GEORGIA NIGRO, professor of psychology at Bates College

Despite the growing prominence of campus-community engagement and public scholarship in higher education, little has changed since Cruz and Giles (2000) first questioned the absence of community perspectives in the service-learning research literature. As Stoecker and Tryon (2009) note, asking community partners to define what impact should look like is especially rare. Yet the question of how academic institutional priorities like civic engagement depend on and relate to community aspirations is a pressing ethical and political issue.

Who participates—in setting agendas, defining goals, and creating values? Who benefits? How do we know? These questions must be central to the assessment of community-engaged teaching and research. Assessing the Practices of Public Scholarship (APPS), a working/research group of higher education professionals and cultural practitioners, is ensuring this centrality by elaborating and promoting an integrated approach to assessment.

APPS is sponsored by Imagining America (IA), a national consortium of higher education institutions and allied organizations. Founded in 2000, IA is committed to advancing the public purposes of the cultural disciplines—the arts, humanities, and design—by transforming university research and teaching to promote community partnership and development. APPS emerged in 2009 in response to findings from IA’s Curriculum Project (Goldbard 2008), which exposed the lack of sustained, reciprocal partnerships in community cultural development—an approach that recognizes arts and culture as major assets in building community capacities, envisioning alternative futures, and catalyzing social change.

Core Values

The APPS approach to assessment integrates questions about community impact into project and partnership designs, involves community stakeholders meaningfully and collaboratively, and invites evaluation of university practices in relation to mutually defined goals. To support this approach, APPS has articulated a set of five guiding values for assessment: collaboration, reciprocity, generativity, rigor, and practicability (see sidebar).

These core values are not unique: they borrow from multiple literatures and fields (see, for example, Bandy 2012). But centering them offers an intervention of sorts. While IA members have expressed strong desires for practical tools to help them negotiate various demands for assessment, they have also upheld the value of context and narrative, favored qualitative over quantitative methods, and evidenced less concern with generalizability than many social science researchers. The core values offer a flexible and adaptable framework that provides a process to engage in and with rather than a model or tool to apply.

The core values also offer grounds for engaging critically with the multiple institutional agendas that drive assessment—and for renegotiating their terms. Institutional mandates for assessment are often tied to funding and program continuation, making high-stakes, short-term, and relatively inflexible evaluation methods imperative for stakeholders. Significantly, these mandates tend to focus assessment efforts on making the case for particular projects or programs instead of on forging deeper understandings of the processes or strategies that facilitate or impede programmatic goals. An integrated approach to assessment recognizes these realities and provides alternatives, countervalues, and guiding questions that can reframe assessment demands.

APPS’s preliminary research suggests that the core values coexist in dynamic and productive tensions—both with one another, and with the practical realities that community and higher education partners inhabit. For instance, stakeholders engaging in collaborative and reciprocity-minded assessment may challenge each other’s understanding of scholarly rigor. Similarly, assessment practices that live up to the highest collaborative ideal may not be practicable at a given moment or scale.

An integrated approach to assessment holds these tensions in balance, emphasizing both the practicable and the generative, the near-term and the long-term, the imperfect process and the aspirational goal. It opens the timeframe of impact assessment and allows space for examining the effects of sustained engagement, documenting mistakes as well as successes, and reflecting collaboratively and rigorously on both.

Case Studies

What do integrated approaches to assessment look like in action? Given the challenges inherent to the project of developing and assessing collaborative partnerships, what does it mean to try to actualize these values? APPS has sought to answer these questions and deepen discussion through a series of case studies examining projects and
partnerships within the IA membership network and beyond. The IA website features these case studies, which illustrate integrated assessment principles and the challenges of realizing them.

One example comes from MIT@Lawrence, a sustained partnership between the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) and the city of Lawrence, Massachusetts, that involves collaborative projects ranging from neighborhood revitalization to property management. In MIT@Lawrence, collaboration, reciprocity, and generativity have emerged—but not right away, and not without colliding with other values, such as practicability. To document the project’s long-term outcomes, MIT students videotaped interviews of Lawrence residents, yielding over three hundred hours of interviews for analysis. Project director Lorlene Hoyt registered some discomfort with the collaborative balance: because Lawrence residents did not have time to serve as editors, students effectively shaped the story. Practicability dictated this outcome. Yet screenings of the resulting film afforded opportunities for reflection and dialogue with Lawrence residents, illustrating the core value of reciprocity.

APPS case studies are exercises in critical self-analysis that promote discussion, learning, and exchange among IA members seeking to deepen their own engagement through assessment. At IA’s annual meetings, discussions of assessment have moved beyond questions of expediency and self-congratulation to engage challenges like how to report problematic findings to partners and sponsors, how to value and measure intangibles like empathy and spontaneity, and how to document dynamic processes and changes that emerge over time. APPS is identifying and creating new venues for exploring these topics, including a recent webinar on the challenges of coordinating and aligning assessments at the level of the university, the school or department, and the project or course.

Evolving Approaches
APPS suggests that an integrative approach to assessment informed by core values and current research can activate, deepen, and sustain organizational conversations about the practices of publicly engaged scholarship and community–campus partnerships. This work is ongoing, iterative, and evolving. But within the field of engaged cultural research and teaching, APPS and IA have problematized assessment as an ethical and epistemological challenge, to be met critically and creatively.  

The authors would like to thank Sylvia Gale, Pam Korza, and Joe Bandy for their contributions to this article, which relies heavily on the collective work of APPS members: Joe Bandy (Vanderbilt University), Miriam Bartha (University of Washington), Adrienne Falcon (Vanderbilt University), Sylvia Gale (University of Richmond), Pam Korza (Animating Democracy, Americans for the Arts), Georgia Nigro (Bates College), Susan Schoonmaker (Imagining America), Gladys Palma de Schrynemakers (Long Island University), and Stephani Etheridge Woodson (Arizona State University).
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Guiding Values for Integrated Approaches to Assessment
The Assessing the Practices of Public Scholarship (APPS) approach, elaborated at www.imaginingamerica.org, centers on the following values:

- **Collaboration:** Community and university stakeholders define meaningful outcomes from the outset and throughout project implementation.
- **Reciprocity:** Community and university stakeholders engage in mutual and transformative exchange, including reflection, feedback, and critique.
- **Generativity:** Assessment activity feeds the project, program, or course, while also looking beyond these units and inviting stakeholders to evaluate the long-term relationships at the heart of public work.
- **Rigor:** Assessment activity uses sound methods and practices.
- **Practicability:** Methods and practices are proportionate to the project and to available resources.

—Miriam Bartha and Georgia Nigro

As part of the MIT@Lawrence project, Lawrence youth present results of a collaboration with Massachusetts Institute of Technology students to document activities for youth in the city. (Photo by Leo Burd)
Programs that Build Civic Identity: A Study of Alumni

TANIA D. MITCHELL, assistant professor of postsecondary teaching and learning at the University of Minnesota
RICHARD M. BATTISTONI, professor of political science and public and community service studies at Providence College
ARTHUR S. KEENE, professor of anthropology at the University of Massachusetts Amherst
JOHN REIFF, director of civic engagement and service learning at the University of Massachusetts Amherst

Colleges and universities often implement civic learning and democratic engagement initiatives with the goal of creating what Musil (2003) terms “generative citizens.” But there is a gap in the literature when it comes to assessing these initiatives’ long-term impact and efficacy. To begin filling that gap, we are studying alumni of civic learning programs to determine whether their lives demonstrate a commitment to active and involved citizenship that aligns with Knefelkamp’s (2008) vision of civic identity.

Civic identity is a multifaceted and dynamic notion of the self as belonging to and responsible for a community or communities.

Study Design
The study focuses on three cohort-based, multi-term civic learning programs: the Public Service Scholars Program at Stanford University, the Citizen Scholars Program at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, and the Public and Community Service Studies major at Providence College. (For information on these programs and their conceptual frameworks, see Mitchell et al. 2011.) These programs share a focus on building civic agency and on challenging participants to see themselves as engaged scholars and actors working for a better world. Each program recruits student participants and engages those participants as a cohort, providing curricular opportunities for dialogue, reflection, values clarification, and knowledge acquisition. All promote civic engagement through requirements that range from developing an honors thesis focused on a community issue to working with a community organization over multiple semesters.

We are using a mixed-methods approach (Creswell 2009) to study the three programs and their alumni. Working with each campus, we generated a database of almost four hundred alumni across the three programs. We then interviewed ten alumni from each program (selected to ensure diversity of race, gender, and cohort) using a loosely structured protocol. After transcribing these interviews and coding them for analysis, we used our initial findings to construct a survey that we distributed to alumni via email. The survey had a 49 percent response rate (192 respondents) and yielded preliminary data that will inform further quantitative analyses. In this article, we share findings related to career choice and the cohort experience.

Career Choice
Program alumni have largely entered careers that could be characterized as serving the public good. Among survey respondents, 39 percent were in community-oriented careers such as community organizing, nonprofit management, or social work. Another 26 percent were working in K–12 schools. Fifty-seven percent of respondents felt that their experiences in the programs influenced their career choices.

Fifty-three percent of surveyed alumni strongly agreed that “their personal values and beliefs are well integrated and aligned with [their] work and career.” A Stanford University alumna speaking about her approach to work shared, “I think I’ve always had sort of underlying impetus in doing things for the greater good and to make people’s lives better, and I feel like that carries through to today.” Similarly, a University of Massachusetts alumnus explained, “[T]here is never a time where I want to be doing work that’s not good work...making some kind of change.” Alumni have found ways to align their values and beliefs with their professional
work, and they see service as a core value. Fifty-seven percent of survey respondents strongly agreed that “the education and knowledge that [they] have gained should be used to serve others,” and another 28 percent agreed with that statement.

Interview participants whose primary work was not community-based or defined by service for the public good described efforts to link their work to community or service. A Providence College alumna offered, “I feel like sometimes it’s small gestures, but it’s ways that I can still feel connected and feel that I’m able to still do good with the business that I have.” Seventy-six percent of survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed “that professionals have a civic responsibility to improve society by serving others,” and similar numbers reported participating in community or political work. Interviewees indicated feeling that as citizens they should, in the words of a University of Massachusetts alumna, “make an impact.” A Stanford University graduate noted, “...in my sort of idealistic world, everyone should feel some kind of obligation to serve the outside world, no matter what they have or what their situation is.”

The Cohort Experience
The cohort experience has been a prominent theme in our early analysis. Fifty-eight percent of survey respondents indicated that their program cohort was “extremely important” to their learning and development. As one Providence College graduate reflected, “It was great to have that kind of core of people around that you knew were kind of thinking the same way, were kind of in it all together.” For one Stanford alumna, the “sense of community” amongst people who were working “to do something for the greater good” was “the most important thing about the program.”

A University of Massachusetts alumna described the cohort as lessening her feeling of isolation as a person committed to community service. “You weren’t the only weirdo getting up at…7:30, 8:00 to go do something on a Saturday while everyone else is sleeping in till 2:00…we didn’t feel so isolated... other people were also contributing.” Fifty-nine percent of survey respondents agreed, identifying “having a group of students who shared your interests and concerns” as “extremely important to [their] learning.”

The same University of Massachusetts graduate noted the importance of classroom conversations where cohort members with “different life experiences” helped each other “work through some of [their] assumptions.” In the words of a Providence College alumna, the trust that participants built with their cohorts meant that they could “call each other out.” Participants expressed confidence in their willingness to ask questions, be challenged, and “bring to the table [issues] that you were working through that you might not have brought up into [sic] a different class or with folks that you hadn’t been learning with constantly” (a University of Massachusetts graduate). The data demonstrate that the cohort-based learning environment was extremely important to participants.

Conclusion
Each of the multi-term civic learning experiences we are studying endeavors to develop engaged scholars and actors working for a better world. Our preliminary analysis shows that the cohort aspect of these programs is important to students’ learning and experiences, and that the civic identity students develop through these experiences persists in their lives after college. As we continue our analysis, we hope to better understand the programmatic and curricular elements that facilitate civic identity development, as well as the ways alumni exercise civic identity in their professional and civic circles.
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Throughout its history, American higher education has prepared students for principled citizenship in a democratic society. Yet in recent years, public critique has focused ever more sharply on higher education’s role in fueling economic growth (National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement 2012). In the face of these pressures, several educational leaders and organizations, including the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), have called on colleges and universities to recommit to preparing students to become active workers and citizens. Fortunately, these are complementary goals. By helping students develop civic capacities like a sense of personal and social responsibility, higher education institutions can equip students to contribute to both civic and economic life.

In this globally interconnected age, the implications of personal and social responsibility extend beyond domestic borders. Recognizing this, many colleges and universities have expanded their goals to include global dimensions of student learning, such as global perspective. Global perspective takes into account the ways in which people’s worldviews and cultural traditions influence how they think, feel, and relate to others. It also acknowledges the need to empathize with persons who differ dramatically from oneself.

To advance education for personal and social responsibility that takes into account today’s global contexts, educators would be wise to ask: What college experiences are most influential in fostering elements of personal and social responsibility, including global perspective?

Researchers initially created the Personal and Social Responsibility Inventory (PSRI) as part of the AAC&U initiative Core Commitments: Educating Students for Personal and Social Responsibility. After conducting an extensive literature review and consulting with nationally recognized experts, L. Lee Knefelkamp and Richard Hersh, with research assistance from Lauren Ruff, identified five dimensions of personal and social responsibility: striving for excellence, cultivating academic integrity, contributing to a larger community, taking seriously the perspective of others, and developing competence in ethical and moral reasoning and action. Now administered by Iowa State University, the PSRI assesses campus climate along each of these five dimensions by collecting and analyzing data reported by students, faculty, and staff.

Institutions that participate in the PSRI receive information about their campus climate for learning and development, along with comparison data from other participating institutions. Institutions have used PSRI data to identify and implement powerful policy changes to improve the climate for student learning and development (Glass and O’Neill 2012; Reason forthcoming). For example, the University of Central Florida (UCF) responded to PSRI data by instituting a “Z-grade” policy that holds students accountable for academic integrity violations. Students who violate academic integrity policies receive a “Z” designation on their transcripts, which they can remove by completing an academic integrity seminar and retaking the course—an option that nearly all affected students have taken (O’Neill, forthcoming). Other institutions have used the PSRI data to inform accreditation reports or assess specific civic education initiatives.

Researchers at Iowa State University have begun to connect PSRI climate data with more objective measures of student learning outcomes, including outcomes related to openness to diversity, active citizenship, and social action taking. AAC&U’s Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) rubrics offer another way of measuring students’ development along dimensions...
related to personal and social responsibility, such as civic knowledge and engagement, intercultural knowledge and competence, and ethical reasoning. By using the PSRI in combination with these rubrics, campuses can begin to connect measures of campus climate to assessments of important learning outcomes.

**Global Perspective Inventory**

*How do I know? Who am I? How do I relate to others?* These three questions provide a framework for the Global Perspective Inventory (GPI) (Braskamp et al. 2012). The GPI measures students’ development along cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal dimensions using six scales, focused on students’ approaches to knowing and the degree of their knowledge (cognitive), their sense of identity and their affect when encountering unfamiliar perspectives and situations (intrapersonal), and their sense of social responsibility and the degree of their social interaction (interpersonal). Students who take the GPI provide information about these dimensions and answer questions about their college experiences, including the frequency and quality of global learning opportunities in the curriculum, cocurriculum, and community.

Colleges and universities use the GPI in three primary ways. They administer the GPI to first-year students at college entry to assess their initial level of global perspective taking and evaluate their high school experiences. They use the instrument with cohorts of students at all class levels to measure differences in global perspective taking and variations in students’ experiences in and out of the classroom. Finally, they administer the GPI to students before and after they participate in study abroad programs to measure changes in their global perspective taking and their level of participation in a range of experiences while abroad.

Institutions draw on the resulting data to guide follow-up research or to frame discussions among faculty and administrators about pedagogical strategies to enhance global perspective taking. They use results to compare the experiences of American and international students and to compare themselves with their peer institutions. Many institutions use GPI data in their accreditation quality improvement initiatives or draw on results to make changes in their academic programs and offerings.

**Conclusion**

Education for personal and social responsibility in a global society has never been more important—nor has the assessment of related learning outcomes and campus climates. The PSRI and GPI are essential parts of institutions’ assessment portfolios as they work to ensure that students become more open to diverse perspectives and achieve the capacities necessary for citizenship and global understanding. Now more than ever, higher education must reinvest in educating citizens, with an expanded understanding of citizenship as requiring a global perspective (National Task Force 2012).

To learn more about the Personal and Social Responsibility Inventory, visit www.pstri.hs.iastate.edu. To learn more about the Global Perspective Inventory, visit http://gpi.central.edu.
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**Tips for Using Survey Instruments Effectively**

1. **Prepare the campus.** Increase the likelihood that students and professionals will complete e-mail surveys by publicizing the surveys and e-mailing announcements from recognizable campus figures.

2. **Offer institutionally appropriate incentives.** To garner increased response rates, offer low-cost incentives that appeal to students, such as drawings for preferential parking spots or extra meal points.

3. **Use findings to start conversations.** The most effective use of assessment results may be to start open and honest conversations on campus.

4. **Look for data that contradicts assumptions.** The most beneficial findings may be those that contradict assumptions about what the data will show.

5. **Look at differences between different groups.** Differences in perceptions or behaviors between groups are important areas for focused discussion.

6. **Connect findings to existing data.** Institutional researchers can use personally identifiable information to explore how the data relate to important outcomes like GPA, retention to graduation, and extracurricular engagement.

7. **Be transparent about the use of data.** Share results with survey participants by referring to the data in newspaper articles or institutional memos and explicitly connecting findings to changes in policies and practices.

—Robert D. Reason and Larry A. Braskamp
Engagement with diversity is essential for democracy, and learning outcomes for all students improve when a campus community provides opportunities for students to engage with people who are different from themselves (Milem, Chang, and Antonio 2005). Recognizing this, many colleges and universities are making serious attempts to advance their demographic diversity and enrich the diversity content of their curricular and cocurricular offerings. But institutions are at different stages of this process and may be missing opportunities to engage more fully with diversity. To move beyond isolated diversity initiatives marked by what William T. Lewis (2009) has called “islands of excellence” and create environments that are both richly diverse and energized through engagement with diversity, institutions must maximize their effectiveness by continually assessing their progress and realigning their efforts. Campus-wide assessments that take into account all aspects of support for diversity can provide the baseline necessary for designing purposeful diversity work.

How can institutions successfully assess their multifaceted diversity change initiatives? Members of the Multicultural Affairs Think Tank (MATT) at the New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE) focused on this question at a meeting held in 2011. Subsequently, a subgroup of MATT members noted a need for diversity assessment tools that are systemic in nature rather than focused on individual units such as student affairs, academic affairs, or human resources. These MATT members saw a need for a tool that would bring stakeholders together—whether across divisions or within specific units—to gather information about existing diversity efforts. They decided to create a rubric to serve these purposes.

The MATT rubric team envisioned their rubric as a fitting complement to existing assessment tools like Estela Bensimon’s Equity Scorecard, which evaluates access and equity for historically underrepresented students (Bensimon 2004), and Damon A. Williams, Joseph B. Berger, and Shederick A. McClendon’s Inclusive Excellence Scorecard, which explores how both internal structures and external pressures affect attempts to diversify an institution (Williams, Berger, and McClendon 2005). To create its rubric, the team drew on another existing model: Andrew Furco’s Higher Education Service Learning Institutionalization Rubric (2010), a self-assessment instrument measuring the extent to which a college or university has institutionalized service learning. Furco not only agreed to allow the team to use his rubric as a basis for their work, but also offered guidance and support as the rubric team began developing and refining its new tool: the Self-Assessment Rubric for Institutionalization of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in Higher Education (the Diversity Rubric).

**Rubric Structure and Protocols**

The Diversity Rubric examines an institution’s relevant accomplishments through six dimensions: (1) Philosophy and Mission of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion; (2) Faculty Support and Involvement; (3) Curriculum, Pedagogy, and Research; (4) Staff Engagement and Involvement; (5) Student Support and Involvement; and (6) Administrative Leadership and Institutional Support. For each dimension, the rubric team identified a number of components (see sidebar), which users can modify for use in their own contexts.

For each component, the team established a three-stage continuum of development. Progression from stage one to stage three suggests that an institution is moving closer to fully institutionalizing diversity, inclusion, and equity on its campus. **Stage One: Emerging** identifies a campus that is beginning to recognize diversity, inclusion, and equity as strategic priorities and is building a campus-wide constituency for the effort. **At Stage Two: Developing**, a campus is focused on ensuring the development of its institutional and individual capacity to sustain diversity, inclusion, and equity efforts. **Stage Three: Transforming** indicates that a campus has fully woven diversity, inclusion, and equity into its institutional fabric, but continues to assess its efforts to ensure sustainability in an ever-changing environment.

The Diversity Rubric is designed to be used in a variety of institutional contexts, and the rubric team created several protocols for its use. With the Small Group/High Level protocol, senior cabinet members can use the tool to assess their individual divisions and share results with other campus leaders to shape strategic and long-range planning. Using the Large Group/Multilevel approach, a team of individuals at many levels (for example, a campus-wide diversity council) can use the rubric to evaluate perceptions of current progress at the institution. With the Limited Group/Multilevel protocol, individuals at
many levels in a few areas of campus can use the rubric to self-assess their areas of work and advance their planning and operational goals. (For example, a provost could use the faculty or curriculum dimensions of the rubric in discussions with deans to further teaching and learning goals.) Users have the option of creating their own protocols, and additional protocols will undoubtedly emerge. Like an audit, the snapshot obtained using these protocols can provide baseline data against which to measure progress.

In all cases, the rubric should stimulate conversations and self-reflection that assist university leadership in advancing institutional diversity goals, thus fostering greater understanding of how different areas of the institution align and interrelate. The rubric is only one tool for assessing progress toward becoming a fully diverse, equitable, and inclusive institution, and it may be most revealing when complemented by campus climate surveys, alumni questionnaires, curriculum audits, policy reviews, and other assessment options.

Inviting Participation
At present, the Diversity Rubric is in its final stages of development. NERCHE is planning to pilot the rubric at a range of institutions, including liberal arts colleges, public and private universities, and community colleges. The rubric team invites Diversity & Democracy’s readers to read more about the rubric on NERCHE’s website (http://www.nerche.org/) and to contact NERCHE to provide feedback.

Housed at the University of Massachusetts Boston, NERCHE convenes a number of think tanks for higher education professionals seeking to share best practices and become active learning communities. NERCHE’s Multicultural Think Tank Rubric Team members include Chelsea Clarke (NERCHE), Ande Diaz (Roger Williams University), Jacinda Felix-Haro (Suffolk University), Glenn Gabbard (NERCHE), Judy Kirmmse (Connecticut College), William Lewis (Virginia Tech), Mable Milner (College of the Holy Cross), Rachel Ramos (Wheaton College), and Melvin Wade (University of Rhode Island). The authors would like to thank Brad Arndt, Glenn Gabbard, John Saltmarsh, and Melvin Wade for their contributions.
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Rubric Components

The Self-Assessment Rubric for Institutionalization of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in Higher Education contains six dimensions (green), each characterized by corresponding components (yellow).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Philosophy and Mission</th>
<th>II. Faculty Support and Involvement</th>
<th>III. Curriculum, Pedagogy, and Research</th>
<th>IV. Staff Engagement and Involvement</th>
<th>V. Student Support and Involvement</th>
<th>VI. Administrative Leadership and Institutional Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition of diversity, inclusion, and equity</td>
<td>Faculty knowledge and awareness</td>
<td>Knowledge and awareness of diversity in relation to individual disciplines</td>
<td>Staff knowledge and awareness</td>
<td>Student leadership</td>
<td>Coordination of institutional efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning</td>
<td>Faculty involvement and support</td>
<td>Faculty teaching and learning strategies and methods</td>
<td>Staff engagement and involvement</td>
<td>Student incentives and rewards</td>
<td>Policy-making entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment with institutional mission</td>
<td>Faculty leadership</td>
<td>Student diversity learning outcomes and assessment</td>
<td>Academic departments</td>
<td>Non-academic units</td>
<td>Diversity-focused staff positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment with education reform efforts</td>
<td>Faculty rewards</td>
<td>Staff incentives and rewards</td>
<td>Institutional evaluation and assessment</td>
<td>Institutional research</td>
<td>Hiring and retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>Faculty development and incentives</td>
<td>Student incentives and rewards</td>
<td>Institutional resource management</td>
<td>Specialized initiatives</td>
<td>Professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical and geographical context</td>
<td>Academic departments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Liberal Education Is America’s Promise

SUSAN ALBERTINE, vice president for diversity, equity, and student success

In November 2012, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) adopted a new mission statement. Its single elegant sentence (printed on the facing page) places liberal education and inclusive excellence at the heart of higher education’s collective work, forming a dual commitment to guide colleges and universities in purpose and in practice. Having articulated the first of the two terms in its “Statement on Liberal Education” in 1998, AAC&U’s board of directors began in spring 2013 to compose a complementary state-

tment—defining “inclusive excellence” in the context of AAC&U’s work to advance diversity and equity in higher education.

The resulting statement, titled “Diversity, Equity, and Inclusive Excellence” and printed in this issue of Diversity & Democracy, draws on the Principles of Excellence and the Essential Learning Outcomes articulated through AAC&U’s centennial initiative, Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP). As LEAP underscores in its very name, liberal education is America’s promise, extending opportunity to each individual and community it reaches. Advocating a high-quality liberal education for all students, AAC&U emphasizes the importance and value of such an education for those students from historically underserved populations who traditionally have been least likely to receive it.

The principle of inclusive excellence is particularly critical in the present context, as the United States faces unprecedented demographic change and a complex legal and regulatory environment. The decision in Fisher v. University of Texas has raised urgent questions about affirmative action and the boundaries of race-based admissions programs, and it will yield complex consequences over time. As these consequences unfold, AAC&U will continue our advocacy and action, insisting that access to the advantages of a liberal education is a civil right for all students. We will continue to stand for this civil right, particularly for students who are low income or first generation; members of racial, ethnic, or sexual minority groups; students with disabilities; students who are poorly prepared for college—students across the full array of difference who are facing disadvantage in whatever form it takes.

Throughout its first century, AAC&U has forthrightly addressed the challenges facing colleges and universities. The association has used its voice to speak to the most urgent philosophical and social questions related to students and faculty, to teaching, and to learning. As the board statement on “Diversity, Equity, and Inclusive Excellence” maintains, we will continue to speak, to question, and to act for fundamentally democratic ideals.

In its current strategic plan, AAC&U sets four major goals for its present work and its second century of leadership. Among these is “Equity: Innovation, Inclusive Excellence, and Student Success.” As we work to achieve this goal, we will “accelerate broad-scale systemic innovation to advance educational practices that engage diversity and challenge inequities in order to make excellence inclusive” (2013, 1). Among the pivotal leverage points the plan identifies, one in particular sets the course for our work on equity and inclusion: “With underserved students rapidly becoming the new majority in higher education, there is an opportunity and a responsibility to integrate AAC&U’s work on high-quality liberal learning and high-impact practices with innovations and systemic change initiatives intended to support higher levels of student attainment” (6).

There is, as we see it, no separating the quality of student learning from the diversity of learners. In a diverse society, the ability to learn with and from diverse peers is a critical component of excellence and a necessary component of preparation for work, life, and citizenship. Inclusive excellence can and should be the hallmark of democratic education in our society and a strength that we can offer to educators around the world. Through liberal education and action to make excellence inclusive, we can foster innovative approaches to learning that are sustainable and resilient across higher education, particularly in broad-access institutions and for today’s highly mobile students and contingent faculty populations.

We invite you to join our board of directors in calling for learning that expands access and achievement—whatever the sector, whatever the mode of learning—whoever the student, whoever the educator.
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Diversity, Equity, and Inclusive Excellence
A Statement of the Board of Directors of the Association of American Colleges and Universities

The mission of the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) is to make liberal education and inclusive excellence the foundation for institutional purpose and educational practice in higher education. (Adopted November 2012)

“A great democracy cannot be content to provide a horizon-expanding education for some and work skills, taught in isolation from the larger societal context, for everyone else…. It should not be liberal education for some and narrow or illiberal education for others.”

The Quality Imperative (AAC&U Board of Directors 2010)

The Association of American Colleges and Universities’ commitment to equity begins with the conviction that all students who have completed high school deserve the opportunity to attend college and to obtain an education that will prepare them well for work, life, and citizenship. The learning needed for full participation in the life of this diverse American democracy has long been what AAC&U means by a liberal education.

As AAC&U’s board of directors affirmed in 1998, liberal education is “global and pluralistic. It embraces the diversity of ideas and experiences that characterize the social, natural, and intellectual world. To acknowledge such diversity in all its forms is both an intellectual commitment and a social responsibility.” In embracing a diversity of ideas and experiences, liberal education likewise embraces a diversity of people, for the opportunity to learn with and from diverse peers is also a critical element of educational excellence. This commitment to diversity and equity in all their forms is what we mean by inclusive excellence.

To make excellence inclusive, our society must break free of earlier views that an excellent liberal education should be reserved for the few. Instead we insist that liberal education should be an expectation for all college students. Increasing college access and degree completion for all is necessary but insufficient to foster the growth of an educated citizenry for our globally engaged democracy. We need to define student success not exclusively as degree attainment, but also as the achievement of the primary goals of liberal education: broad and in-depth knowledge, the capacity to integrate and apply learning to new situations, and the intellectual creativity and resilience to face challenges.

We must be vigilant to ensure not only that all students have access to such an education, but also that they have an equitable opportunity to demonstrate what they have learned. A high-quality education must be documented by robust assessment. At the institutional level, we need to provide effective evidence-based pedagogies and inclusive program designs. We must build on students’ talents and capacities—focusing on the assets that all students bring to college rather than on perceived deficits.

Making excellence inclusive means attending both to the demographic diversity of the student body and also to the need for nurturing climates and cultures so that all students have a chance to succeed. Commitment to student success in these terms requires broad-based, compassionate leadership and equity-minded practice—not only within individual institutions, but also across states and systems and in policy circles that make decisions affecting the nation. Seeking inclusive excellence requires reversing the current stratification of higher education and ensuring that all students develop capacities to prosper economically, contribute civically, and flourish personally.

Making excellence inclusive is a fundamentally democratic ideal. It expresses our confidence in the liberating power of education. Without inclusion, there is no true excellence.

Adopted by the Board of Directors of the Association of American Colleges and Universities, June 2013

NOTE
1. “Equity-mindedness” means that educational leaders, faculty, and staff demonstrate awareness of and proactive willingness to address their institution’s equity and inequity issues (Bensimon 2007).
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Opportunities

Call for Submissions: Public
Imagining America invites submissions for the second issue of its new peer-reviewed multimedia e-journal, Public. As described on the website, Public “takes up Imagining America’s commitment to make visible the value of humanities, arts, and design in building democratic culture with people across traditional divisions of knowledge and from multiple contexts.” To learn more about the journal and the call for submissions, visit public.imaginingamerica.org.

IUPUI Assessment Institute
Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis will hold its 2013 Assessment Institute on October 27–29, 2013, in Indianapolis, Indiana. The institute will feature approaches to assessing high-impact practices, including service learning and civic engagement, as well as approaches to assessing global learning, among other topics. To learn more, visit www.assessmentinstitute.iupui.edu.

National Women’s Leadership Forum
The American Council on Education’s (ACE’s) Inclusive Excellence group sponsors two National Women’s Leadership Forums each year. This year’s second forum will take place on December 4–6, 2013, in Alexandria, Virginia. ACE invites nominations of and applications from senior-level women administrators interested in becoming college presidents, vice presidents, or deans. For more information, visit www.acenet.edu/leadership/programs/.

Errata
In the recently published Spring 2013 issue of Diversity & Democracy, on pages 2 and 24, the name of contributing author Roy Schiesser was misspelled. We regret and apologize for the error.

Resources

AAC&U VALUE Rubrics
Many AAC&U VALUE Rubrics featured in this issue of Diversity & Democracy are available for free download on AAC&U’s website. The rubrics currently include the Civic Knowledge and Engagement—Local and Global Rubric, the Intercultural Knowledge and Competence Rubric, the Ethical Reasoning Rubric, and the Global Learning Rubric. To download these and other rubrics focused on AAC&U’s Essential Learning Outcomes, visit www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/.

Shared Futures Tools for Assessing Global Learning
In addition the Global Learning VALUE Rubric featured in this issue of Diversity & Democracy, AAC&U’s Shared Futures project has developed and disseminated several tools for assessing global learning in various contexts. These include a survey tool for assessing general education outcomes and a matrix for evaluating course-level student learning. Many of these resources and tools are available online at http://www.aacu.org/SharedFutures/Tools.cfm.

Student Success and the Quality Agenda Podcasts
AAC&U hosted its second annual Network for Academic Renewal Meeting on Student Success in Miami, Florida, in April 2013. Plenary speakers included Shaun Harper, who spoke of “An Anti-Deficit Approach to Equity, Excellence, and Student Success,” and Valerie Purdie-Vaughns, who described “Identity and Stereotype Threat: Powerful Influences for Student Development, Achievement, and Performance.” Free podcasts of these and other plenary presentations are available online at www.aacu.org/Podcast/.

Service-Learning Reflection Journals
Purdue University is offering two recently published handbooks as free resources for faculty and students: the Service Learning Reflection Journal, and the International Service Learning Reflection Journal. Part of the Purdue University Learning and Service Engagement Series (PULSE), both handbooks offer pre- and post-experience assessment tools, as well as assignments to promote student reflection. To download these publications, visit http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/sps_ebooks/.

Rubrics for Reflection and Civic-Minded Graduates
Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis has developed several tools to assist practitioners in evaluating evidence of students’ ability to reflect and of their development toward becoming civic-minded graduates. Rubrics focused on these outcomes are available for free download at http://csl.iupui.edu/assessment/classroomTools.cfm.

Civic Engagement Resources
Connecticut Campus Compact offers several free resources focused on civic and community engagement. These include the publications Civic Learning Developmental Pathway: Envisioning a Framework for the Engaged Citizen and A Framework for Community-Engaged Scholarship. To download these and other resources, visit http://blog.fairfield.edu/campuscompact/resources/overview.
Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (CLDE) Calendar

The following calendar features events on civic learning sponsored by members of the Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (CLDE) Action Network and others. For more information, please see the websites featured below, or visit AAC&U’s CLDE Calendar online at http://www.aacu.org/civic_learning/events.cfm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>CLDE MEMBER EVENT</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>WEBSITE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>11–13</td>
<td>Interfaith Youth Core New York City Interfaith Leadership Institute</td>
<td>New York, New York</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ifyc.org">www.ifyc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE) Annual Lynton Colloquium on the Scholarship of Engagement</td>
<td>Boston, Massachusetts</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nerche.org">www.nerche.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>3–5</td>
<td>AAC&amp;U Network Meeting: Global Learning in College: Asking Big Questions, Engaging Urgent Challenges</td>
<td>Providence, Rhode Island</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aacu.org">www.aacu.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4–6</td>
<td>Imagining America 2013 National Conference</td>
<td>Syracuse, NY</td>
<td>imaginingamerica.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23–25</td>
<td>Third Annual Eastern Regional Campus Compact Conference</td>
<td>Philadelphia, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>ercompact.org</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Anchor Institutions Task Force 2013 Annual Conference</td>
<td>Baltimore, Maryland</td>
<td><a href="http://www.margainc.com">www.margainc.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AAC&U and the Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (CLDE) Action Network

As part of its commitment to preparing all students for civic, ethical, and social responsibility in US and global contexts, and building on the momentum generated by the 2012 White House release of the report A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy’s Future, AAC&U has formed the Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (CLDE) Action Network. Coordinated by Caryn McTighe Musil, AAC&U Senior Scholar and Director of Civic Learning and Democracy Initiatives, the network includes thirteen leading civic learning organizations that are committed to making civic inquiry and engagement expected rather than elective for all college students. Diversity & Democracy regularly features research and exemplary practices developed and advanced by these partner organizations and their members:

- American Association of State Colleges and Universities
- Anchor Institutions Task Force (AITF)
- Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U)
- The Bonner Foundation
- Bringing Theory to Practice (BTtoP)
- Campus Compact
- Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE)
- The Democracy Commitment
- Imagining America
- The Interfaith Youth Core (IFYC)
- Kettering Foundation
- NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education
- New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE)
Upcoming AAC&U Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETING</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NETWORK FOR ACADEMIC RENEWAL</td>
<td>Providence, Rhode Island</td>
<td>OCTOBER 3–5, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Learning in College: Asking Big Questions, Engaging Urgent Challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETWORK FOR ACADEMIC RENEWAL</td>
<td>San Diego, California</td>
<td>OCTOBER 31–NOVEMBER 2, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transforming STEM Education: Inquiry, Innovation, Inclusion, and Evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAC&amp;U ANNUAL MEETING</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>JANUARY 22–25, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality, E-Quality, and Opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About Diversity & Democracy

Diversity & Democracy supports higher education faculty and leaders as they design and implement programs that advance civic learning and democratic engagement, global learning, and engagement with diversity to prepare students for socially responsible action in today’s interdependent but unequal world. According to AAC&U’s Statement on Liberal Learning,”By its nature…liberal learning is global and pluralistic. It embraces the diversity of ideas and experiences that characterize the social, natural, and intellectual world. To acknowledge such diversity in all its forms is both an intellectual commitment and a social responsibility, for nothing less will equip us to understand our world and to pursue fruitful lives.” Diversity & Democracy features evidence, research, and exemplary practices to assist practitioners in creating learning opportunities that realize this vision.

About AAC&U

AAC&U is the leading national association concerned with the quality, vitality, and public standing of undergraduate liberal education. Its members are committed to extending the advantages of a liberal education to all students, regardless of academic specialization or intended career. Founded in 1915, AAC&U now comprises nearly 1,300 member institutions—including accredited public and private colleges, community colleges, and universities of every type and size. AAC&U functions as a catalyst and facilitator, forging links among presidents, administrators, and faculty members who are engaged in institutional and curricular planning. Information about AAC&U membership, programs, and publications can be found at www.aacu.org.

AAC&U Membership 2013

(1,303 members)

- MASTERS 31%
- BACCALAUREATE 24%
- ASSOCIATES 12%
- RES & DOC 17%
- OTHER* 16%

*Specialized schools, state systems and agencies, and international affiliates
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