



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

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

Here are first-hand observations from our faculty: 1) our students are brave to speak up; they are very active and eager to ask questions, even for those very simple questions; 2) not all of our students want to engage in classroom discussions, so sometimes we need to call their names to encourage them to participate; 3)

the amount of data makes it hard to draw firm conclusions on stud



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

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

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

The second meeting discussed Oral Communication. One of the major challenges for the University in

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

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





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

With only one data point for each of the Sustainability and Social Responsibility ILOs, the assessment results cannot be generalized beyond the programs which participated. The one program that assessed the Sustainability ILO recorded very high student skill levels. They had incorporated additional instructor feedback on assessed essays allowing students to address any issues and strengthen their arguments. For the one program that assessed the Social Responsibility ILO, skill levels were also high, and improved from the last cycle in which it was assessed. It was pointed out

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

IER has also identified a cohort of co-curricular support areas during the '21-'22 academic year that includes housing, recreation and wellness, student conduct, ASI, and veteran student services. IER's work with these areas include establishing assessment plans with measurable student success outcomes (e.g., reducing equity gaps, reducing academic

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