



TLEF Project – Final Report

Report Completion Date: (2020/04/29)

1. PROJECT OVERVIEW

1.1. General Information

Project Title:	Community Engaged Learning at UBC: Developing student assessment tools and guidelines to support learning outcomes and student experience		
Principal Investigator:	Shadi Mehrabi/Y2; Jason Penner/Y1		
Report Submitted By:	Shadi Mehrabi		
Project Initiation Date:	May 2018	Project Completion Date:	April 30, 2020
Project Type:	<input type="checkbox"/> Large Transformation <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Small Innovation <input type="checkbox"/> Flexible Learning <input type="checkbox"/> Other: [please specify]		

1.2. Project Focus Areas – Please select all the areas that describe your project.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Innovative assessments (e.g. two-stage exams, student peer-assessment)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Teaching roles and training (e.g. teaching practice development, TA roles)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Curriculum (e.g. program development/implementation, learning communities)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Experiential and work-integrated learning (e.g. co-op, community service learning)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Open educational resources



1.3. Project Summary

Developing measurable outcomes and student assessment is an on-going challenge faced by faculty who deliver community-engaged learning (CEL) (Taylor and Leffers, 2016). While other institutions have developed methods to assess student learning in community-engaged courses (University of Maryland, 2016), UBC faculty would benefit from methods that serve their specific courses and support better CEL teaching and learning practices at UBC.

Building on the Centre for Community-Engaged Learning’s effort to enhance teaching and learning practices of faculty delivering CEL courses, this two-year project developed general and course-specific student learning assessment tools (such as self-assessment surveys and reflection framework and rubrics) for UBC’s Community Engaged Learning courses. Based on the outcomes of a series of consultation activities (such as workshops, interviews, surveys) with the faculty who used our resources, general guidelines were developed to support future faculty across the university to design their own methods in other CEL courses. These would serve as open educational resources with the potential to support faculty delivery and subsequently student learning for CEL courses across UBC.

1.4. Team Members – Please fill in the following table and include **students**, undergraduate and/or graduate, who participated in your project.

Name	Title/Affiliation	Responsibilities/Roles
Latika Raisinghani	PhD Candidate, Curriculum Studies Faculty of Education	Graduate Academic Assistant
Natalia Balyasnikova	PhD Candidate, Teaching English as a Second Language, Faculty of Education	Graduate Academic Assistant
Neila Miled	PhD Candidate, Educational Studies, Faculty of Education	Graduate Academic Assistant
Hamed Helisaz	PhD Student, Mechanical Engineering, Department of Mechanical Engineering	Graduate Academic Assistant
Mary Victor Kostandy	PhD Candidate, Educational Studies, Faculty of Education	Graduate Academic Assistant

1.5. Courses Reached – Please fill in the following table with **past**, **current**, and **future** courses and sections (e.g. HIST 101, 002, 2017/2018, Sep) that have been/will be reached by your project, including courses not included in your original proposal (you may adapt this section to the context of your project as necessary).



Course	Section	Academic Year	Term (Summer/Fall/Winter)
DHYG 310	001	2018-2019	Fall
DHYG 410	001	2018-2019	Fall and Winter (Full Year)
ADHE 330	001	2018-2019	Winter
NURS362	001	2019-2020	Fall
INFO250	002	2019-2020	Winter
VANT140	V07,V08,V09,V10	2019-2020	Winter
AMECH 220	1RM/2RM	2019-2020	Fall
SOCI 102	V01	2019-2020	Winter



2. OUTPUTS AND/OR PRODUCTS

2.1. Please **list** project outputs and/or products (e.g. resources, infrastructure, new courses/programs). Indicate the current location of such products and provide a URL if applicable.

Product(s)/Achievement(s):	Location:
Assessment Guideline	https://ccel.ubc.ca/assessment-and-evaluation-community-engaged-learning#3
CEL Reflection Framework	https://ccel.ubc.ca/assessment-and-evaluation-community-engaged-learning#3
Report and Presentation Rubric + Adaptation for a Dental Hygiene course	https://ccel.ubc.ca/assessment-and-evaluation-community-engaged-learning#3
Critical Reflection Rubric + Adaptation for an Adult Education course	https://ccel.ubc.ca/assessment-and-evaluation-community-engaged-learning#3
Project Proposal Rubric for Dental Hygiene (Adaptable)	https://ccel.ubc.ca/assessment-and-evaluation-community-engaged-learning#3
Community Engagement Client Care Rubric (Adaptable)	https://ccel.ubc.ca/assessment-and-evaluation-community-engaged-learning#3
Pre-post course Survey + Pre-post course survey analysis guide	https://ccel.ubc.ca/assessment-and-evaluation-community-engaged-learning#3
Community Partner Interview Protocol	https://ccel.ubc.ca/assessment-and-evaluation-community-engaged-learning#3
Community Partner Feedback Survey	Being posted on the CCEL Webpage
Critical Reflection on Community Engagement Assignment Examples (DEAL Model) + Related Rubrics	Being Poster on the CCEL Webpage
Engineering Graduate Attributes: Student Self-assessment	Being posted on the CCEL Webpage
Engineering Graduate Attributes: Rubric for CEL courses	Being Posted on the CCEL Website

2.2. Item(s) Not Met – Please list intended project outputs and/or products that were not attained and the reason(s) for this.

Item(s) Not Met:	Reason:
NA	NA



3. PROJECT IMPACT

3.1. Project Impact Areas – Please select all the areas where your project made an impact.

- Student learning and knowledge
- Student engagement and attitudes
- Instructional team teaching practice and satisfaction
- Student wellbeing, social inclusion
- Awareness and capacity around strategic areas (indigenous, equity and diversity)
- Unit operations and processes
- Other: [please specify]

3.2. What were you hoping to change or where were you hoping to see an impact with this project?

– Please describe the intended benefits of the project for students, TAs, instructors and/or community members.

Engaging faculty in the process of design, development and evaluation, of these assessment tools and resources was done in an effort to ensure their broad applicability across multiple CEL offerings. The collaborative process was also expected to result in the development of guidelines and tools to be added to the CCEL's faculty toolkit and Professional Development strategy as open access online resources.

Further, appropriate assessment and evaluation of learning plays an important role in students' motivation and participation in community engaged courses. The following are some of the anticipated impacts of the project:

- Enhanced student experiences in CEL courses by improving teaching and assessment
- Greater inclusion of student voice into the development of pedagogical and assessment used to facilitate their learning in CEL courses and curriculum.
- Enhanced student engagement and learning by increasing access to excellent learning opportunities by faculty members interested in developing new CEL opportunities.

3.3. Were these changes/impacts achieved? How do you know they occurred? – What evaluation strategies were used? How was data collected and analyzed? You are encouraged to include copies of data collection tools (e.g. surveys and interview protocols) as well as graphical representations of data and/or scenarios or quotes to represent and illustrate key themes.

The changes and impacts were achieved. Highlighted below are the efforts undertaken to evaluate the tools and the perspectives of faculty and students using the tools.



Evaluation Process:

Phase One: Needs Assessment and Tool Design

The project's evaluation plan was integrated within the design and implementation of the tools and instruments and included 5 phases. During each phase, information was gathered and disseminated by the engaging faculty and students to comment on the design, to participate in the development and to provide feedback on the application of the tools.

In the phase one, the CCEL office worked with CEL faculty members to develop course specific tools for AHDE 330 and DHYG 410. This part of evaluation helped the development of the content and tools. This was done through a 10 minute survey sent to all CEL instructors to evaluate expectations across university.

A pre survey obtained student perspectives on evaluation and assessment in CEL oriented courses. The instructors' and students' pre-surveys played an important role in establishing of the base line of UBC faculty and student expectations and needs and also played an important role in the design of the instruments.

Phase Two: Data Collection and Tool Revision

Phase two of the evaluation occurred as follows:

- After the design process, two faculty members piloted assessment tools in their CEL courses.
- CCEL garnered faculty and student feedback on application of the instruments in their courses.
- CCEL revised tools and guidelines based on the student and faculty feedback.
- CCEL used the feedback to assist our understanding of the faculty and student experiences for inclusion in resources such as Faculty Toolkit and PD workshops.

Phase Three: Online Access to UBC Faculty

In phase three, after revisions, we completed the pilot testing by making the toolkit further available to the rest of faculty and obtained their feedback on the application of the developed tools and CEL assessment guidelines. Based on their feedback we made any appropriate changes needed and added the tools to the CCEL faculty toolkit online. The following tools are now accessible online on the CCEL Webpage:

- Assessment Guideline
- CEL Reflection Framework



- Report and Presentation Rubric + Adaptation for a Dental Hygiene course
- Critical Reflection Rubric + Adaptation for an Adult Education course
- Project Proposal Rubric for Dental Hygiene (Adaptable)
- Community Engagement Client Care Rubric (Adaptable)
- Pre-post course Survey + Pre-post course survey analysis guide
- Community Partner Interview Protocol

Phase Four: Broad Dissemination and More Tool Development

After the tools were posted online, CCEL worked on a dissemination strategy to reach its voice about the new tools to the broader community across the campus. Posting an announcement about the tools on the Centre's monthly newsletter, communicating the tools with key units and key people across the campus, presenting in different academic venues such as CTLT Institutes and hosting events to present the tools to faculty were the Centre's key activities on disseminating the tools. Once more people heard about the available tools, some faculty reached CCEL and asked for some other tools that were missing among the developed tools. On a second round of consultation with some CEL faculty in a focus group session, the gaps in the available tools were identified and few other tools were developed. The following tools were developed after the broad dissemination of the tools and the second round of needs assessment:

- Community Partner Feedback Survey
- Critical Reflection on Community Engagement: Assignment Examples using DEAL Model + Related Rubrics
- CEL Final Report Rubric
- Engineering Graduate Attributes: Self-assessment for Students
- Engineering Graduate Attributes Rubric for CEL course

Phase Five: New Tools in Use in the Age of Covid-19

The new tools (Except the tools related to engineering attributes that will be piloted in fall 2020) along with other available tools were adapted and tested in the following courses in winter 2020: NURS362, INFO250, VANT140, MECH 220, SOCI 102.

Faculty's feedback on the application of the tools were collected through email and phone conversations due to the Covid-19 changes in on-campus presence. Faculty who were planning to deploy Community Partner Survey to their CPs at the end of the term had to postpone their feedback collection



to a later time because of the new circumstances. Students' feedback on the tools (on reflection activities and assignments and rubrics) were collected through their instructors as much as it was possible.

Even though the data collection for this phase was disrupted by these unexpected changes, the CCEL is determined to gather information on the application of the new tools once faculty members and community partners are ready to share more specific information to revise the tools. CCEL is dedicated to channel part of its capacity into ongoing feedback collection and refinement of the tools.

Summary of the key Findings:

The following are some of the key themes from the instructors and students' feedback to show the impact of the tools:

Student Learning:

- **Making meaning of experience through critical reflection:**

Pointing to the reflection activities and critical reflection rubric, students stated that the tools helped them to critically think about their engagement process and connecting their experiences within the community with their learning in the class. Most of the students agreed that question prompts and rubric criteria help them reflect critically on their experiences to make meaning out of them. One student stated:

“The reflection discussions and paper helped me to think about my experience in a structured and critical way. The questions directed my thinking process towards making meaning out of my experience. Working with a community is exciting but my reflection process helped me to dig deep and see my “self” in relation to community and to explore my positionality and power. This process opened my eyes”

Pointing to the critical reflection rubric another student mentioned:

“I really like rubrics. They give me a good sense of the instructor's expectations. I think the reflection rubric was a bit complex but very helpful in shaping my thoughts around my experiences in the course.”

- **Understanding community context**

Students also mentioned that the reflection assignments, specifically in the early phases of their engagement, helped them to critically think about the concept of “community” and to take an asset-based lens about the communities they were engaged in. One of the students stated:

“After one of the class discussions, when I was reflecting on the question of ‘what is community for you?’ I realized that my perspective about community has shifted from seeing deficits of a community to it’s strengths. Communities are great places to learn from.”

Students also mentioned the role of the reflection tools in identifying transformative moments of learning and unlearning during their experiences.

- **Understanding role of discipline**

Most of the students believed that the reflection activities, critical reflection and Community Engagement rubrics helped them to get a better sense of the role of their discipline in the society. They stated that the readings, reflection discussions/activities and assignment helped them become sensitive to varying cultural, social and economic situations of communities and better position themselves as reflective practitioners in relation to communities.

“Now I have a better understanding of my role as a dental hygienist in communities. I used to see myself as someone with expertise who help community in need but now I see my role differently.”

Teaching practices:

- **Benefiting from students and community’s voices in teaching**

Instructors reported that the tools were comprehensive and easy to adapt. They believed that the tools are a great means to provide a space for students and community voices to shape their teaching practices. They found Pre-post Course Survey as a great means to show the progress/change in the students’ understanding of community engagement (self-reported). They believed the tool showed them the areas in which students needed more attention. Moreover, faculty who used the Reflection Framework and activities reported the framework as a valuable resource to capture students’ voices about the course and their own engagement:

“The questions in the Framework were great prompts to elicit students’ voices and to help them to speak up about their beliefs, assumptions, biases, positionality, and roles in relation to community. The reflection on their “self” and “community” and their learning informed my teaching a lot.”

Faculty also appreciated the Community Partner Interview Protocol and found it important in giving voice to community partners about students’ experiences and their partnership with UBC:



“This is a Community Engaged Learning Course. Students and myself work with faculty and it is meaningless to ignore their feedback and insight about the whole process. Their feedback would definitely inform my future partnership and practices”

- **Improvising teaching practices during the course implementation:**

Faculty reported that the tools, specifically the reflection activities helped them to improvise their teaching practices based on the students’ ongoing reflection and feedback:

“Students’ reflections were great guide for my teaching practices. Sometimes they helped me to improvise in the class and change my strategy and practice based on students’ reflection. They were deep and informative”

In general, they reported that the tools improved their teaching practices.

Tool refinements based on the students and faculty’s feedback:

- 1) Critical Reflection and Community Engaged Learning Report and Presentation rubrics were revised, using less complex language with criteria that are more general. They were reported as “easy to use” on the second iteration in other courses. The instructors believed that the examples of assessment rubrics (developed and adapted for other courses) would better support faculty to develop their own assessment instruments in their CEL courses.
- 2) Two more questions about students’ experiences were added to the Community Partner Interview Protocol to better inform faculty about community’s perspective on students. Moreover, a full Community Partner Feedback survey with more questions was developed for instructors who do not find interview as a good mean to gather information about their partnership with and students’ experiences in communities.
- 3) A few reflection assignment examples were developed to better support faculty and students who use the Centre’s Reflection Framework. This tool was developed as a response to faculty’s interest (those who already used the reflection framework) in seeing more reflection assignment examples to use adapt for their future courses.
- 4) An editable pre-populated excel sheet was added to the Pre-Post Course Survey Analysis Guide for faculty to easily analyze their collected data.
- 5) The Instructor Assessment Guidelines language was refined and shared with broader community of faculty. In the second iteration, most faculty reported that the tool was very helpful in giving them a good sense of “assessment” in different phases of their courses, from planning to evaluation stage.

6) Comprehensive instructions to use were added to each tool. These instructions will help faculty to adapt the tools based on their needs.

3.4. Dissemination – Please provide a list of ***past*** and ***upcoming*** scholarly activities (e.g. publications, presentations, invited talks, etc.) in which you or anyone from your team have shared information regarding this project.

Title of the presentation	Type of Presentation	Presenters	Event	Time
Developing student assessment tools and guidelines to support learning outcomes and student experience	Poster Presentation	Shadi Mehrabi and Natalia Balyasnikova	TLEF Showcase	May, 2019
Evaluating a community engaged learning course: Tools and strategies	Workshop	Shadi Mehrabi and Richard Arias-Hernandez	CTLT Spring Institute	May, 2019
Community Engaged Learning: Assessing Student Learning In our Classes	Workshop	Shadi Mehrabi and Neila Miled	CTLT Winter Institute	December, 2010
Supporting Community Engaged Learning Course Assessment	Workshop	Shadi Mehrabi and Emily Truong-Cheung	CTLT TA Institute	Jan, 2020
Using and Assessing Reflection Activities in Community Engaged Learning Courses	Workshop	Shadi Mehrabi, Katherine Lyon, and Emily Truong-Cheung	CTLT Spring Institute	May, 2020

4. TEACHING PRACTICES – Please indicate if your teaching practices or those of others have changed as a result of your project. If so, in what ways? Do you see these changes as sustainable over time? Why or why not?

The feedback gathered from the instructors about the application of the tools and their impacts on their teaching practices shows that the tools have been informing the instructors’ teaching practices by giving a good picture of students’ strengths and weaknesses, students’ experiences in the class, their partnership with communities, and the areas that need more attention. The tools have been helpful in examining the course and assessing their course outcomes. The tools are designed in way that the instructors can benefit from them with minor adaptation in any CEL courses they teach in future.

5. PROJECT SUSTAINMENT – *Please describe the sustainment strategy for the project components. How will this be sustained and potentially expanded (e.g. over the next five years). What challenges do you foresee for achieving the expected long-term impacts listed above?*

- 1) Online and easy access to the tools and resources:** The guidelines and tools developed in this project are now added to the faculty toolkit and UBC community-engaged faculty have online access to piloted and tested assessment guidelines and tools that enable them to understand the experiences of students in the classrooms and communities. Beyond CEL courses, the accessibility of the tools and instruments enables all faculty and instructors to gain familiarity with the CEL context at UBC. One of the aims of sharing resources is to encourage experiential teaching and learning pedagogies.
- 2) Guidelines and example to use the tools:** Benefiting from an instructor’s guide for CEL assessment, faculty will be able to adapt and refine their teaching practices and engage in CEL professional development to complement their discipline specific expertise and improve teaching and learning. We have also provided examples of adapted rubrics and pre-post course survey analysis guide to support faculty to adapt rubrics for their courses and to analyze the data from pre-post surveys to inform their practices.
- 3) Ongoing assessment support from the Centre for Community Engaged Learning:** The tools are designed in a way that provide enough information and guideline for faculty to do their course assessment without further support. Yet, Centre staff will continue their supports for faculty who need expertise in assessing their courses. 1:1 consultations with faculty will help them to have a better understanding of their assessment needs and to choose right assessment tools from the Center’s assessment tools developed in this project. The staff will further support faculty to adapt the tools based on their needs. For a longer term, staff will use their capacity to gather more feedback (through the Centre’s end of term survey) from faculty who use the tools and will continue refining the tools to address the faculty’s needs.