

Camp Council on Assessment & Learning Meeting

Mar 13, 2026, 10-11:30am, via Zoom

Council Members Present

(indicated by check mark):

- Sarita Shukla (Chair) SES
- Yolanda Padilla FYPP
- Sara Maxwell IAS
- Alejandro Francetich BUS
- Thomas Humphries STEM
- Vacant SNHS

ExOfficio NonVoting Members Present

(indicated by check mark):

- Leslie Hurst - University Libraries
- Deborah Hathaway - Teaching & Learning
- Kim Swensen - Teaching & Learning
- Elizabeth Blake - Institutional Research

Guests:

- Cinnamon Hillyard
- Gulru Özkan-Seely

Welcome, Updates, and Adoption of Minutes

Lead: Sarita Shukla, CCAL Chair

Shukla welcomed everyone and led a brief ice breaking conversation before moving into meeting business.

- February CCAL minutes passed.
- Adjustment to Agenda Order
 - Shukla noted that the guest scheduled for the institutional assessment conversation had not yet joined due to power and connectivity issues. She proposed temporarily proceeding out of agenda order to address other scheduled items while waiting for the guest to join.

Updates from the Office of Student Academic Success

Lead: Sarita Shukla, CCAL Chair

Guest: Cinnamon Hillyard, Associate Vice Chancellor and Dean for Student Success

- **Key Points:**
 - Hillyard said she had no substantive updates on the tri-campus learning outcomes due to the Council on Academic Standards meeting being cancelled.
 - Noted that Sean Gehrke, lead on the tri-campus undergraduate learning outcomes work, will be attending Apr 7 Executive Council meeting to gather faculty feedback. CCAL members are encouraged to join.

Shukla thanked Hillyard for the updates and noted she plans to attend the Apr7 EC meeting.

Discussion and Vote on CEL Recommendation Letter

Lead: Sarita Shukla, CCAL Chair

Shukla reintroduced the CEL ULG recommendation letter, reminding members that the committee had discussed the letter previously and that she had incorporated feedback received since the last meeting.

- **Key points:**
 - Revisions strengthened language about embedding community-engaged learning across curricula.
 - The letter acknowledged asymmetries in access to CEL opportunities across schools and programs.
 - Edits reflected feedback submitted by CCAL members.

**MOTION by Padilla to approve CEL ULG recommendation letter for EC.
 SECONDED by Francetich
 PASSED**

Shukla thanked everyone and moved on to the next agenda item.

Dr. Özkan-Seely: Institutional Assessment Perspectives from AACSB Work

Lead: Sarita Shukla, CCAL Chair

Guest: Gulru Özkan-Seely, Assoc. Prof., Area Coordinator, Operations Management and Information Systems - UWB School of Business

Shukla returned to the scheduled agenda, welcomed Özkan-Seely and invited her to share insights from AACSB re-accreditation work.

Özkan-Seely described her role in AACSB re-accreditation and provided an overview of the accreditation timeline, expectations, and how assurance of learning is structured and implemented within the School of Business.

- **Key points:**
 - The School of Business received AACSB accreditation in 2020 and is preparing its re-accreditation report in the current cycle.
 - The accreditation process includes submission of a comprehensive report followed by a site visit planned for the next academic year.
 - AACSB places strong emphasis on faculty composition, faculty ratios, and assurance of learning processes.
 - Assurance of learning is organized around program-level learning goals established for each degree program.
 - Direct measures are drawn from student work in required core courses aligned with specific learning goals.
 - Assignments used for direct measures vary and may include exams, written work, oral presentations, or specific components of larger assignments.
 - Indirect measures include alumni and exit surveys, employer and advisory board feedback, and community partner perspectives.
 - Consistent data collection requires coordination across full and part-time faculty.
 - Pandemic disruptions affected assessment consistency, while recent quarters have allowed for improved standardization.
 - Newly launched programs have learning goals in place and will be incorporated fully once sufficient data are available.

- **Discussion:**
 - Question raised about what qualifies as direct assessment beyond Canvas materials
 - Özkan-Seely explained that instructors assess aligned components of student work and report anonymized results.
 - Question raised about how oral presentations are handled
 - Özkan-Seely clarified that instructors assess performance components tied to learning goals rather than relying on recorded artifacts.
 - Question raised about quantitative assessment examples
 - Francetich described assessment using student performance on targeted exam questions aligned with learning goals.
 - Question raised about how diversity-related learning goals are assessed
 - Özkan-Seely noted that diversity and ethics are embedded within certain learning goals and supplemented by descriptive analyses.
 - Question raised about standardization across programs
 - Özkan-Seely explained that program learning goals and course mappings were established during earlier accreditation cycles and continue to guide assessment.

Shukla thanked Özkan-Seely for sharing her experience and emphasized the value of learning from accreditation-driven assessment practices.

Diversity Report Feedback from Schools: Look Back to Forge Ahead

Lead: Sarita Shukla, CCAL Chair

Shukla reintroduced the compiled reflections on feedback received from schools regarding the diversity assessment report, framing the document as a record of institutional learning intended to inform future assessment work.

- **Key points:**
 - Reliance on Canvas-based direct measures alone limits understanding of student learning.
 - Combining direct and indirect measures provides a more nuanced assessment.
 - Clear and measurable learning goals support more effective evaluation.
 - Institutional assessment should be iterative and responsive to lessons learned.
- **Discussion:**
 - Question raised about incorporating existing data sources such as NSSE and exit surveys
 - Blake, Institutional Research, explained that these sources add valuable context but require careful interpretation.
 - Concern raised about repurposing data collected for other purposes
 - Blake emphasized the importance of transparency about intent and limitations.
 - Observation raised about differences between self-reported experience and curricular evidence
 - Swensen, Learning & Teaching, highlighted the value of triangulating methodologies.

- Question raised about whether assessments measure opportunity or growth
 - Blake noted the need to clarify this distinction.
- Concern raised about the measurability of some current learning goals
 - Swensen emphasized the importance of clearer, more accessible language.

Shukla summarized additions and noted that the document would be revised and revisited briefly at a future meeting.

Tri-campus Undergraduate Learning Outcomes Mapping Continued

Lead: Sarita Shukla, CCAL Chair

Shukla guided members through the next phase of the mapping activity, inviting them to continue working collaboratively to examine alignment, overlap, and differences between UWB learning goals and tri-campus outcomes.

- **Key points:**
 - Members examined areas of alignment and divergence across learning goals.
 - Differences in specificity and framing were noted, particularly around leadership, collaboration, and creative thinking.
- **Discussion:**
 - Observation raised that UWB learning goals articulate competencies more explicitly than the tri-campus learning outcomes
 - Discussion emphasized that the two frameworks operate at different levels of specificity, and members agreed this structural difference should be documented rather than resolved through one-to-one alignment.
 - Question raised about the implications of explicit versus embedded language.
 - Discussion focused on how explicit naming increases visibility and assessability, while embedded language allows for greater disciplinary flexibility. Members agreed this tension is important to surface.
 - Concern raised about whether all graduates realistically encounter every listed competency.
 - Noted that competencies may be addressed through graduation and general education requirements in addition to major coursework, and members acknowledged the goals reflect institutional aspirations rather than uniform student pathways.
 - Question raised about discipline-specific interpretation of broadly framed competencies.
 - The council recognized that ambiguity may complicate consistent assessment and noted the need for continued attention to shared understanding as mapping work progresses

Shukla highlighted major themes and reiterated the importance of articulating UWB's distinctive priorities and thanked everyone for their input before moving on to final agenda item.

Identify Action Items

- **Items identified:**

- Continue tri-campus learning outcomes mapping work.
- Share the approved CEL recommendation letter with GFO EC.
- Revise and briefly revisit the diversity reflections document.
- Consider inviting colleagues to share assessment practices from other accreditation contexts.
- Suggestion raised to invite someone to speak about ABET accreditation in engineering. Although noted as a good idea, since an accreditation review is not currently in progress, it was not pursued at this time
- Commitment noted to share updates about diversity assessment conversations within schools.

Shukla thanked members for their engagement and adjourned the meeting.

Minutes submitted by Dawn Moncalieri based on recording of meeting
Meeting adjourned 11:30pm
The next CCAL meeting is Mon, Apr 13, 11:30am-1pm via zoom