

ISJ Subcommittee Report May 18, 2016

Faculty Present at the May 17, 2016 ISJ Assessment Meeting:

Richard Clark; Mindy Peden; Sara Schiavoni; Rodney Hessinger

Findings

We had hoped to describe the findings from the eight ISJ courses that had submitted data. Unfortunately, first we noted that the analysis was incorrect, and second we noticed a key coding error.

The above notwithstanding, there is clear variation both within and among the eight courses as to the extent to which our students met specific ISJ learning goals. Due to the problems noted above, we are unable to determine exactly where we may have failed to help our students “meet expectations”.

Suggestions for Instructors

Since we do not have clear data on where our students failed to meet expectations, it is difficult to offer recommendations that address an unknown problem.

Evaluation of Processes

Like most new endeavors there was a learning process for both the committee and the faculty who were submitting ISJ applications. As the process moved forward, the application and review process became easier. For starters, the Core Committee created a series of questions that were useful in assessing applications. These questions are:

- 1) Does the content of the course meet the learning objectives?
- 2) Are assessment mechanisms in place for each of the learning objectives?
- 3) Is there sufficient specificity in the assessment mechanisms?

Once these guidelines were established the review process became easier. Moreover, in cases where the committee wanted greater clarification, these guidelines made it easier to suggest to our colleagues where their proposals needed work.

Recommendations for Internal Changes

Please see the above. It would be helpful if the questions used by the subcommittee to assess each proposal could become part of the application material. Where most proposals fell short on their initial review was a failure to specify exactly where the ISJ

learning goals would be taught; and/or a failure to clearly specify how the learning goals would be evaluated.

Recommendations for Core Committee

We have several recommendations. They are:

- 1) To make the process of assessment easier and hopefully more meaningful, we are suggesting that the ISJ rubric be reduced to just three questions. These questions are:
 - a. Does the student “Understand human and cultural differences?”
Assessed by Meets Expectations if the student “Communicates an understanding of human and cultural differences”
 - b. Can the student “Examine the conditions that have given rise to injustice?”
Assessed by meets expectations if the student “ Understands the historical/structural conditions that have given rise to injustice”
 - c. Does the student “Understand the consequences of injustice?” Assessed by Meet expectations if the student “Recognizes an injustice and articulates the consequences of that injustice”

- 2) Throughout the 2015/2016 academic year, concerns have been raised regarding
 - a. Are there some courses that due to the content of the course do not meet the spirit of an Issue in Social Justice course? What are these courses and how will they be identified may need to be addressed.
 - b. A proposal is forthcoming to have a single course with multiple section received ISJ designation. Is this acceptable?

- 3) While we recognize the obligation to work with our colleagues, if a select course consistent fails to have its students meet the ISJ learning objectives at what point does the course lose its ISJ designation? We believe it is counterproductive to continue to label a course an ISJ course if the ISJ learning goals are not being met.