

## Standing Committee

### End-of-Year Report, 2017-2018

**Committee:** Diverse Perspectives

**Chair:** Veronica Koehn

**Committee Membership:** Sharon Beaudry, Barry Canaday, Dibyajyoti Deb, and Wakaya Wells (Suzanne Hopper was a member in the fall and winter but stepped down before the spring term)

What were the committee charges this year?

1. This was the engage year for Diverse Perspectives, so our charge was to engage the campus.

What did the committee accomplish this year?

1. To engage the campus, including students, we first brought on a new committee member, Wakaya Wells, the new Multicultural Student Services coordinator. With Wakaya, we were able to coordinate campus-wide engagement and highlight the importance of Diverse Perspectives across campus. One way that we emphasized Diverse Perspectives across campus was through tagging Diverse Perspective events that were highlighted on the monthly campus calendar (that is reproduced and posted across campus, including in the bathroom stalls). The “DP” tag showed students that, in fact, Oregon Tech does have opportunities to engage with diverse others. This was in direct response to findings from the NSSE, which showed that Oregon Tech students did not perceive that there were opportunities to engage with diverse others at Oregon Tech. While such opportunities did and do exist, students were not making the connection. By highlighting different events as “DP,” we hoped that students could begin to see connections between what they are learning in their courses, activities available through Campus Life, and the importance of engaging with diverse perspectives.
2. To engage faculty, we held two workshops. The first one, in week 7 of winter term, focused on familiarizing faculty with the rubric and the criteria. The DP committee, specifically former Chair Ben Bunting and current Chair Veronica Koehn, provided samples of student work from courses that have already been approved as DP courses. The committee printed off multiple copies of the assignments and the rubric and then facilitated a norming session for faculty after going over the outcome, the criteria, and the rubric. *During and after the workshop, the faculty offered substantive feedback on the rubric that resulted in the committee spending the rest of the winter term and the start of the spring term substantially revising the rubric.*
3. With the rubric revised from the first workshop, we held a second workshop in week 3 of spring term, and it was focused on helping faculty to develop assignments that could be used to assess Diverse Perspectives at the Programmatic Practice level. We split into groups and each member of the committee sat with a group of faculty and discussed existing assignments to show how, with minor revisions, the assignments could be used to assess DP. *The faculty really responded well to the revised rubric and only had minor comments on the newly revised rubric. The DP committee spent spring term fully integrating these comments and looks forward to*

*piloting the revised rubric to see if any further revisions are necessary (this is explained in-depth later on in this report).*

What issues and/or additional responsibilities arose this year that influenced the work of the committee?

1. The delayed roll-out of the ESLO model has left the committee hoping that our work is not in vain. We have put a lot of work into the DP outcome over the past five years (Wakaya and Suzanne were the only members who have not been on the committee since its founding), and we would hate to see it come to an abrupt end, but, at the same time, we cannot address all questions that faculty, staff, and students may have as we are not sure where the model is at and thus not sure where the outcome is at . . .
2. Early on, we had a Wilsonville faculty member who was often unable to attend the meetings and thus did not have much input into the outcome. This year, an online faculty member (Suzanne Hopper) was added, but she also stepped down as she felt that it was difficult to fully contribute from a distance. Thus, one of our biggest issues seems to be finding and retaining faculty that are not located at Klamath Falls. Since the ELSO model and the DP outcome are college-wide, we need to find a way to fully engage and retain faculty that are not located on the KF campus.

Given what you have learned this year, what goals/charges do you recommend this committee focus on in the upcoming year?

1. Given that we continued to revise the rubric after the second workshop (based on faculty feedback, as explained above), the most recent rubric has not yet been piloted with faculty. In the coming school year, I would like to find a way to have faculty use the rubric to score student work and offer comments as one of our goals is continuous improvement.
2. It seems that some of the ESLO committees were unsure about how to proceed with tagging practicing level courses, DP included. With clear guidance and permission, we could continue to evaluate practicing level submissions in the coming school year.