Equity in Assessment: The Grand Challenge and Exploration of the Current Landscape

Shannon Milligan, Terrel Rhodes, Renata Opoczynski, Jessica Nastal, Ciji Heiser and Moreen Carvan

Abstract: Equity, closely tied to the advancement of justice and fairness, remains a challenging ideal to operationalize. Determining whether the field of assessment contributes to or is a barrier to equity is a grand challenge (Singer-Freeman & Robinson, November 2020). This article presents the investigation of this challenge conducted by the Equity in Assessment workgroup of the Grand Challenges in Assessment project. An examination of the current landscape, history, and literature review of assessment suggests that the discipline and practice of assessment must first acknowledge and challenge its origins in order to reframe both theory and practice to meet the goal of moving towards equity in assessment. The workgroup proposes means by which equity-oriented processes can advance assessment, and the ways in which assessment can be used to support equity.

Keywords: *equity, assessment, culturally responsive evaluation, structural inequities, national accountability*

Introduction

Equity in Assessment: The Grand Challenge and Exploration of the Current Landscape

The movement for racial justice, amplified in the wake of George Floyd's 2020 murder, has accelerated social and political demands to dismantle structures that institutionalize inequities and to ensure equitable participation and outcomes in economic, political, educational, health, and social systems in the United States. However, equity remains a challenging ideal to operationalize. The racial and socio-economic demographics of students advancing from K-12 to postsecondary education has changed substantially over time. Higher education has become more accessible to students who have been historically underserved in this context. While access to higher education is improving, disparities in educational outcomes persist (Kuh, 2008; National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2016) and suggests that the ways in which underserved students experience higher education is fundamentally different than their peers. In higher education, the movement towards actively dismantling structural inequities requires critical examination of how we define, measure, and utilize outcomes; key concepts in the field of assessment. Before we can use assessment to advance equity, we must first interrogate the conditions that either

contribute to or create barriers to just, fair and equitable outcomes, and assessment processes for all people engaging in educational systems.

Assessment in higher education is uniquely positioned to evaluate higher education and determine barriers and supports of equity. As an operationalized practice, "assessment is the systematic collection, review, and use of information about educational programs undertaken for the purpose of improving student learning and development" (Palomba & Banta, 1999, p. 4). Historically, work in assessment has revealed stark divides in student success, often along race, ethnicity, and social class lines. For example, Chen (2016) found 68% of students enrolled at two-year colleges, and 40% enrolled at four-year institutions, enrolled in developmental English, Reading, and Math courses; these classes are significantly populated by Black and Hispanic/Latinx students, first generation college students, students who are eligible for federal Pell grants (as determined by expected family contribution), and returning adult students. Nastal (2019) demonstrated a case at a minority-serving two-year college where 82% of students enrolled in a developmental writing course identified as Black, and only 9% of those students ultimately earned credit for the college-level course. Research suggests that students who begin in developmental courses persist at lower rates than their peers (Bailey et al., 2008; California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, 2018; Cuellar Mejia et al., 2018). Graduation rates are similarly marked along race and ethnicity lines, shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Graduation attainment within 150% time, disaggregated by race/ethnicity

	2-year Institutions	4-year Institutions
Asian	36%	74%
White	32%	64%
Two or more races	25%	60%
Hispanic/Latinx	30%	54%
Pacific Islander	34%	51%
Black	23%	40%
Native American	27%	39%

Source: National Center for Education Statistics (2016)

Historically, both high rates of enrollment in developmental coursework and low graduation rates among underserved students have been perceived as an indication of their inability to pick themselves up by their bootstraps; their inability to rise above their material conditions (cf. Morante, 1987). However, equity focused perspectives recognize these rates cannot be disconnected from the inequities in academic support and preparation closely connected to the racial injustice in our society. Equity focused assessment, informed by frameworks such as decolonial theories, feminist standpoint theory, and critical race theory, can help highlight how systemic racism, sexism, and other structural inequities can influences these outcomes.

Given this context, it is not surprising that when Singer-Freeman and Robinson (November 2020) issued a call to the assessment community to address the four "grand challenges" in assessment, using assessment findings to increase equity was identified as

one of the four (along with using assessment findings to direct immediate pedagogical improvements; using assessment findings to produce visible and actionable findings that drive innovation; and examining changes in institutional effectiveness over time). The larger purpose of the Grand Challenges Project is to engage in "strategic planning and collective problem solving" to "create solutions" to these challenges facing assessment in higher education (Singer-Freeman & Robinson, November 2020). Our workgroup took this charge as an invitation to use a critical standpoint as we expanded our focus from using assessment findings to increase equity and included a focus on increasing equity within the structures, norms, and behaviors of assessment work. In this article, and in our work, we position the critical examination of assessment as practice, as central to the advancement of equity in education. Without a critical analysis of assessment, the power structures and inequities assessment can create and perpetuate in education would not be identified.

Workgroup's Charge and Process
The charge to each of the four workgroups includes a series of deliverables to be created during 2020 and 2021: a call to action (featured as part of a presentation at the 2020 AALHE conference), strategic plan (presented in draft at the 2020 Assessment Institute and in final form at the 2021 AALHE conference), and culminating paper. To begin the work, prospective workgroup leads were nominated and selected by the Grand Challenges Leadership Team; once workgroup leads were identified, calls for workgroup membership were disseminated using various channels such

as the ASSESS listserv. An advantage to using the ASSESS listserv in particular was the breadth and depth of subscribers, as well as the networks of each subscriber. This solicitation yielded about 26 individuals interested in serving on the equity workgroup. The desire of the co-leads to establish subgroups to more efficiently move the work along allowed for accepting a high volume of members. The co-leads extended additional invitations to help close identified gaps, such as representation from Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). In total, the workgroup has 26 members, representing both 2- and 4-year institutions (public and private); federally recognized Minority-Serving Institutions; and national higher education organizations (for further details, see Appendix). These members also bring a plethora of positionalities to the workgroup, which is integral in problematizing both our charge and existing knowledge, and ultimately in shaping our epistemological foundation for equity in assessment.

The chairs of this working group strived to take an approach guided by core principles of culturally responsive evaluation to develop the strategic plan. Culturally responsive evaluation is both a framework for conducting evaluation as well as a guiding thought process. Culturally responsive evaluation approaches prioritize and embrace cultural perspectives through stakeholder involvement and center stakeholder lived experiences as expertise (Frierson et al., 2002; Hood, et al., 2015; Hopson, 2009). As Hopson (2009) explains,

> Those who use CRE understand and value lived experiences that help to (re)define, (re)interpret, and make

sense in everyday life. By privileging notions of lived experiences and especially regarding communities and populations of color or indigenous groups, new explanations and understandings of evaluations, programs, and phenomena of study emerge. (p. 431)

Centering stakeholder perspectives (in this case the workgroup members) allowed for more meaningful conceptualizations of constructs of equity and assessment, served as a means to unearth inequities, and created space for multiple realities. To develop the strategic plan, the workgroup hosted regular meetings that took the shape of talking circles (Brown & Di Lallo, 2020). Talking circles are "safe spaces where relationships are built, nurtured, reinforced, and sometimes healed; where norms and values are established; and where people connect intellectually, spiritually, and emotionally with other members of the Circle" (Brown & Di Lallo, 2020, p. 367). As a method, a talking circle "increases voice, decreases invisibility, and does not privilege one worldview or version of reality over the other" (Brown & Di Lallo, 2020, p. 367). This approach yielded an abundance of qualitative information grounded in the lived personal and professional experiences of the working group members. These collective stories and experiences, in addition to building on the foundation of existing literature, served as the foundation for the strategic plan draft shared in this article.

The initial focus areas of the workgroup were collectively agreed upon at an early meeting, in order to ensure that they did not only represent the views of the co-leads. The workgroup members then self-selected into subgroups focused on each of the areas. Each subgroup was tasked with creating their own goals and objectives, and subgroups were empowered to create their own methodologies for creating these goals, including drawing from collective expertise and literature reviews.

Historic Structural Inequities in Assessment

Assessment, being both born and nurtured in historically white, male, Euro-centric spaces, has been built on traditions of patriarchy, class, and racial privilege. As such, existing assessment approaches are Euro-centric (Inoue, 2015) and filled with racial and class inequities. Assessment today can even be tied back to early eugenics research. Sir Francis Galton's (1904) theory of eugenics, the science of "all influences that improve the inborn qualities of a race," was foundational to the emerging discipline of sociology and later assessment. Karl Pearson, who published the first journal of modern statistics, Biometrika, strongly argued for the eugenics concept of general intelligence (Galton, 1869), also known as the intelligence quotient (IQ). Binet and Simon (1908) built on this and introduced the intelligence quotient scale (which became the basis for the Stanford-Binet IQ test commonly used today).

In 1916, Henry Goddard, a eugenicist and director of research at the Training School in Vineland, New Jersey, translated and used the Binet-Simon scale for the purposes of identifying the "feebleminded." The author of the first law requiring special education, Goddard was a central figure in establishing the practice of standardized intelligence testing and with it standardized assessment of student IQ and achievement in the United States (Zenderland, 1998). Statistics and norms in

intelligence testing were used as a foundation for the assessment of academic achievement, giving rise to standardized assessments used to determine whether students advanced or did not in public schools. In the early 20th century, the theory of eugenics and its concepts and processes were accepted science, and influenced what knowledge, skill and behavior was considered good and to be improved, and what was not and was to be eradicated. Standardized testing and assessment provided the method and evidence by which people could be sorted into their proper place (Gould, 1981).

While eugenics is no longer an accepted science, it is important to recognize these were the beliefs and goals in which assessment was created, built, and supported. However, in present time, within the climate of accountability to societal injustice and increasing diversity in higher education, calls for assessment approaches that are culturally responsive, equity-centered, improve outcomes for underserved populations, and address educational inequities are emerging (Montenegro & Jankowski, 2017; Zerquera et al., 2018). Montenegro and Jankowski (2017) call on assessment professionals to align assessment practices with practices that better capture the experiences of underserved students and explain that, "by being mindful of how culture affects students' meaning-making process, cognition, and demonstrations of learning, we can better understand and appreciate the learning gains that students make" (p. 13). Assessment practitioners often adhere to forms of assessment that may not fully reflect their cultural ways of knowing, students' cultural ways of meaning making and knowing, or the successful ways student development is nurtured within higher education contexts. Diverse ways of knowing

and practices are often rendered invisible by the assessment community. In higher education, assessment practices that are held up as exemplars and advanced by those in and out of the field, are often established by Predominantly White Institutions (PWI) with 1) student populations who have been positioned for academic and social success and 2) faculty populations whose workload and metrics for excellence in research, teaching, and service are based on norms that do not apply to others working and practicing outside of this identified elite (Heiser et al., 2017; Henning & Lundquist, 2020; Lundquist & Heiser, 2021; Singer-Freemen & Robinson, November 2020).

Assessment is carried out in a system of higher education fundamentally shaped by unscientific notions of race and gender, and structured from its inception to produce an "upper class" of male leaders (Brigham, 1923, 1930; Elliot, 2005; Karabel, 2005). Even as the critique of higher education as an enabler of inequity becomes more prevalent, the norms of assessment continue to center the current structure. Educational systems, including systems of higher education, need to critique and challenge existing assessment standards that are all based on the norms, values, and expectations of the inherently biased system of education in the United States.

Findings of the Equity in Assessment Workgroup
The official charge for the Equity in Assessment Workgroup was to address the challenge of using assessment findings to increase equity. As this work progressed, however, it became clear to the members of the group that this charge: 1) assumes assessment is structured to produce equitable outcomes and 2) ignores the fact that the structures, expectations, and practices of assessment are steeped with inequities.

Attempting to provide recommendations for how to use inequitable outcomes to increase equity leaves a systemic problem unaddressed: individual practitioners, institutions, and national organizations cannot advance equity within the same systems and structures that reproduce and sustain inequities.

The Work We are Calling for in Assessment
The workgroup found our journey to prepare goals, tactics, and assessment measures regarding equity required a foundational critique that led us to seek more equitable ways of assessing; to include more uninvited voices into the conversation and to apply more ways of knowing and doing. Our commitment to engaging in equitable assessment focuses on the importance of methods that prioritize process before product in order to attend to equity and dismantle structural inequities.

In advancing a national conversation about how equity should inform assessment practices, we recognize the work already being done, while simultaneously pushing the boundary, as the assessment profession in higher education has not yet fully adopted a commitment to utilizing data to advance equity. The "best practices" in the field of assessment uphold privilege and power of white, well-resourced institutions and are based on the values, structures, and metrics of those institutions. Our process, and the process of others seeking to use equity to advance assessment, is grounded in feminist methodologies, decolonial educational research, and critical race theory. Grounded in the current social, cultural, and historical moment, we acknowledge the urgency of bringing this work to fruition. Aligning our process with equity-oriented values and creating an inclusive decolonized collaboration space is a unique and critically important

contribution to the Grand Challenges project and other assessment initiatives.

Our colleagues in evaluation, educational measurement, and writing assessment have given a great deal of attention to the role of assessment in sustaining or disrupting systems of oppression. With an emphasis on power and historical context, culturally responsive evaluation and evaluators center the lived experiences of historically marginalized individuals throughout the evaluation process (Frierson et al., 2002; Hood et al., 2015; Hopson, 2009), and focus on creating valid findings which are culturally grounded (Hood et al., 2015). Culturally responsive evaluation calls for those practicing evaluation to engage in critical reflexivity in order to identify the ways in which practitioners may uphold or dismantle systems of power and oppression (AEA, 2011; SenGupta et al., 2004; Symonette, 2004). Culturally responsive evaluation approaches also promote the critical examination of common methods and quantitative tools designed with white populations but used with diverse populations and questions the validity of such tools to accurately capture culturally diverse experiences (Chouinard & Cousins, 2009).

Likewise, the field of educational measurement has long focused on the consequences of assessment (e.g., Messick, 1989; Kane, 2006). It is not enough to demonstrate construct validity, this community of practitioners has urged us to attend to how we use results, how decisions are made with the information, and how those decisions affect communities of learners (Kane, 2013). More recently, attention has shifted to the relationship between validity and fairness: "A test is fair that minimizes the construct-irrelevant variance associated with individual characteristics and testing contexts

that otherwise would compromise the validity of scores for some individuals" (American Educational Research Association [AERA], American Psychological Association [APA], & National Council on Measurement in Education [NCME], 2014, p. 219). In writing assessment, practitioners expand on these concepts, draw on social justice principles (Rawls, 1999), culturally sustaining practices (Ahmed, 2012; Bonilla-Silva, 2009; Crenshaw, 1991; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Paris, 2012; Steele, 1997) and decolonial frameworks (Cushman, 2016; Gomes, 2018) to advance opportunity to learn (Moss et al., 2008; Pellegrino, 2020; Pellegrino et al., 2001) for all students.

Assessment practitioners in higher education can learn from the robust history and literature developed by our colleagues in these and other interdisciplinary fields.

The Work We are Calling on Practitioners to Do

With these observations as context, our workgroup's findings and recommended actions are framed by an understanding of the ways assessment has been used to uphold inequitable systems. While we propose both general and specific means by which equity-oriented processes can advance our understanding of assessment, and the ways in which assessment can be used to support equity within spaces of teaching and learning, we understand equity in assessment and outcomes can never fully be reached without a critical analysis of higher education broadly and the systemic inequities that exist in its history and current manifestations (Ahmed, 2012; Crenshaw, 1991; Patel, 2016).

National assessment leaders have a role to play in 1) critically examining and challenging the status quo of "best practices;" 2) unearthing

systems and structures which enable inequity; and 3) dismantling these systems and structures to advance equity. Emerging work from recognized change agents in assessment, particularly that of the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA) and the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), is gaining a larger audience in the field of assessment and including a growing diversity of voices (McNair et al., 2020). However, the theory and practice of assessment to advance equity is under-researched. There is a substantial gap in the literature in terms of how equity and assessment work is unfolding, or to what extent this work exists across higher education institutions. Clear examples exist of how some colleges and universities are implementing equity-based assessment work, but a broad-based consensus across the field is not evident.

Black, Brown, and Indigenous assessors and evaluators have advanced critical, culturally responsive, and social justice assessment through research and practice for nearly three decades (e.g., Hood et al., 2015; Patel, 2016; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). For instance, the Gordon Commission on the Future of Assessment in Education (2011-2013) was led by preeminent Black psychologist Edmund Gordon, who has significantly contributed to our understanding of opportunity gaps (Gordon, 2020; Gordon Commission, 2013). The Gordon Commission's work continues to influence educational measurement and assessment, evidenced in the shift to a socio-cognitive view of assessment (Mislevy, 2018), prioritizing context and emphasizing the importance of the diversity of learners (Acereda et al., 2018).

In the field of higher education assessment, however, this discussion is largely hosted by white practitioners serving at PWIs (Heiser et

al., 2017; Henning & Lundquist, 2020; Montenegro & Jankowski, 2017; 2020). Emerging practices in higher education related to equity and assessment are all too often reflective of white experiences and ways of knowing, learning, and demonstration of learning. The need for racial diversification in the field of higher education assessment is well illustrated by the finding that 89% of assessment professionals in the United States indicated that they are white on a national survey (Nicholas & Slotnick, 2018). To attempt to leverage assessment findings to advance equity within this context is problematic in that it continues the ongoing marginalization of Black, Latinx/Hispanic, indigenous, and people of color voices rather than intentionally highlighting and integrating these voices into the strategy for meeting this challenge.

What is evident is an emerging consensus on how to leverage assessment findings to advance equity. The consensus is being informed by national dialogues, articles and conference presentations by thought-leaders, case studies, the focused work of national organizations, and documented work at individual institutions.

Goals for Leveraging Assessment Findings to Advance Equity
Within the above referenced context of assessment as a field and the racial injustices present, we suggest the following ways to advance equity in assessment at both the institution level and broader macro assessment level.

First, as assessment structures, norms, and instruments are rooted in white privilege, misogyny, and heteronormativity, it is crucial to critically examine the extent to which the ways we conduct assessment may perpetuate or

resolve existing inequities at the local and national levels. This includes examining the standardized surveys used across higher education, accreditation requirements, what we consider data as a field, and how we measure learning and what counts as learning. Additionally, this same analysis must be conducted at the institutional level and its own definitions, norms, and behaviors.

Further, a key part of equity-based assessment includes listening to and engaging students in the work of assessment. For robust student-engaged assessment to occur, three primary groups must be involved: students, educators, and institutions/programs. An essential foundation is to identify, develop, and evaluate student-engaged assessment practices and frameworks that 1) prioritize assets (rather than deficits) and support social justice within outcomes and assessment and 2) intentionally involve diverse student populations, particularly those differentially impacted by traditional assessment practices.

Additionally, assessment is a deeply contextual practice. Both students and professionals navigate systems and structures related to assessment that foster inequities. Beyond using the assessment process to advance equity, engaging in professional development that addresses bias; highlights different ways of knowing, learning, and measuring; and develops "aware assessors" or culturally competent assessment professionals is key. Because limited knowledge and/or limited opportunity for professional development is often a barrier to incorporating equity-based assessment into assessment work on campus, a centralized warehouse of resources related to professional development, assessment and equity, and diversity, equity, and inclusion work could serve as a catalyst to propel this work

forward in consistent and meaningful ways. This warehouse would be structured with an intentional focus on highlighting work of scholars and practitioners from marginalized identities and those who work at often marginalized institutions.

Within these focus areas, the workgroup has created the following goals as a framework for the Grand Challenges strategic plan.

Goal 1: Promote and create assessment practices that centralize multiple dimensions of equity.
Assessment for equity reflects structural and social considerations that have arisen from social issues and external forces (e.g., accreditation and accountability reporting, background demographic characteristics and experiences of faculty, students and administrative personnel, power relationships, positionality). Assessment therefore must embody an approach to its work within the core culture of higher education based upon inquiry and discovery, but in a way that unearths systems and structures which have caused inequitable outcomes for our already underserved student populations.

This goal examines to what extent an equity-based framework is at the foundation of established good assessment practices such as disaggregating data, closing the loop, and inviting stakeholders to shape interpretation and reporting. We seek to build on existing work (e.g., equity centered assessment, social justice assessment, the Center for Urban Education's equity scorecard) to identify the core aspects of equity-based assessment practice (Oliveri et al., 2020), the extent to which institutions across the country engage in these practices, and the effects of these practices on advancing equity. We will center

the work on diverse ways of knowing, a broad understanding of data and what measures "count," as well as the assessment work done at often marginalized institutions, including HBCUs and two-year colleges.

By 2022 a national model for equity-based assessment, reflective of the cultural diversity in higher education will be published and presented. We hope to see that the majority of accredited colleges and universities will use the model for equity-based assessment, integrate students into their assessment process as stakeholders, use multiple methods to collect data and address equity gaps, identify opportunity structures (Elliot, 2016) to address those gaps, and incorporate student engagement into the assessment process.

Goal 2: To infuse equity in assessment related professional development for faculty, staff and administrators.
There is a pressing need for more professional development around assessment and equity to help faculty, staff, and administrators understand how to do assessment in times of transition, how to be mindful of differential student needs, how to question existing practice, and how to make this work sustainable. We plan to develop a framework and resources for professional development in the area of equity-based assessment by creating an inclusive and accessible online library that is available to assessment professionals.

These materials will include a framework of questions that help assessment professionals to shift to more equitable practices and understand assessment with an equity lens. They will highlight traditional and non-traditional examples of how equity-based assessment training can be managed in a

variety of educational contexts. Pilot programs will include early partners who reflect on their own professional development practices regarding assessment and create content to share. One organization currently doing this work well is the Student Affairs Assessment Leaders (SAAL) who have hosted a repository for assessment resources for over a decade. At the local level, as different universities engage in professional development, informed by the resources we've made available, we will begin to gather data on the effectiveness of professional development as a tool to infuse assessment with equity.

By 2022, a website should be available with a library of resources. This website will serve as an accessible online library made available to assessment professionals. The library will contain resources related to professional development of equity and assessment such as pre-recorded webinars, conference presentations, blog posts, and podcasts.

Goal 3: Address the ways in which existing assessment approaches and mechanisms (e.g., standardized surveys, demographic questions, accreditation requirements, IPEDS reporting) perpetuate or resolve inequities.
Assessment must embody an approach to its work within the core culture of higher education based upon inquiry and discovery, but in a way that unearths systems and structures which have caused inequitable outcomes for our already marginalized student populations. This includes understanding how assessment methods such as national surveys, accreditation systems and cycles, and data measurement may increase inequity or serve as a barrier to equity in assessment. We plan to critically examine national surveys (e.g., National Survey of Student Engagement [NSSE], Collegiate Learning Assessment [CLA], Multi-

Institutional Study of Leadership [MSL]) and national datasets (e.g. IPEDS) to improve the extent to which they are accurate and trustworthy measures for underserved students. This may include critically examining IPEDS demographic categories, the structure and questions asked on NSSE, and other analysis that highlight how white privilege, misogyny, and heteronormativity manifest in commonly used assessment instruments and data collection.

We plan to develop templates and guidance for displaying, representing and sharing assessment results that include disaggregation of findings by student characteristics. We plan to identify national organizations and institutions that can provide specific guidance and training around disaggregation while being mindful of local and international privacy regulations. We will advocate for training in and application of equity protocols for sharing assessment results at the regional and national level. This will require partnering with organizations to invest time and effort in incorporating these equity protocols.
By 2024 we hope to see an increase in the number of accredited colleges and universities that use disaggregated data in assessments and that measure and track opportunity gaps.

Conclusion
Acknowledging the field of assessment is interdisciplinary and diverse; rather than work in isolation, we call on assessment practitioners to intentionally collaborate with stakeholders across campus and across the multidisciplinary field. Doing so, we believe, can enrich local and national practices. Assessment has always been a multidisciplinary field, and that is how it works best. For the writing practitioners among us, assessment began with the 1874 Harvard writing exams, designed to identify students to

enroll in "sub-freshman" English courses (Haswell, 2004). Educational measurement professionals might look to the creation of the College Board in 1900; teacher educators or evaluation professionals to teacher educator programs, focusing on classroom assessment techniques and studying patterns of student learning in a course or program.
In their discussion of complex assessment design for twenty-first century learners, Oliveri and colleagues (2020) used the U.S. Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) taxonomy as they asserted the benefits of assembling multidisciplinary teams in assessment for learning. By taking this broad view of the field, we increase opportunities to draw on and create the "symphonic and polylogical patterns of inquiry" (Royster & Kirsch, 2012, p. 136) so vital to decolonial work.

We believe assessment findings can be used to advance equity, if our practitioners and the methods of assessment are transformed to do the same. We call on you, practitioners in diverse fields, from diverse institutions, working on behalf of diverse student communities, to join us in the work. The future of higher education depends on it.

References

Acereda, A., Liu, L., Markle, R., Oliveri, M. E., & Rios, J. (2018). Signaling success for minority students and minority-serving institutions in an age of credentialing and accountability innovation. In A. G. de los Santos, L. I. Rendon, G. F. Keller, A. Acereda, E. M. Bensimon, & R. J. Tannenbaum (Eds.), *New directions: Assessment and preparation of Hispanic college students* (pp. 13–34). Tempe, AZ: Bilingual Press.

Ahmed, S. (2012). *On being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education. (2014). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

American Evaluation Association. (2011). *Public statement on cultural competence evaluation*. Fairhaven, MA. www.eval.org

Bailey, T., Jeong, D. W., & Cho, S. W. (2008). *Referral, enrollment, and completion in developmental education sequences in community colleges* (CCRC Working Paper No. 15, Rev. 2009). Community College Research Center. New York, NY: Columbia University, Teachers College. http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/publications/referral-enrollment-completion-developmental-education.html

Binet, A. and Simon, T. (1908). The development of intelligence in the child. L'Année *Psychologique, 1908*.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (2009). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in America*. 3rd Ed. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Brigham, C. C. (1923). *A study of American intelligence*. Princeton University Press.

Brigham, C.C. (1930). Intelligence tests of immigrant groups. *The Psychological Review, 37*, 158–165.

Brown, M. A., & Di Lallo, S. (2020). Talking circles: A culturally responsive evaluation practice. *American Journal of Evaluation, 41*(3), 367-383.

California Community Colleges' Chancellor's Office. (2018). *Student success scorecard, statewide degree/transfer completion*. https://scorecard.cccco.edu/scorecardrates.aspx?CollegeID=000#home

Chen, X. (2016). *Remedial coursetaking at U.S. public 2- and 4-year institutions: Scope, experiences, and outcomes* (NCES 2016-405). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2016/2016405.pdf

Chouinard, J.A., Cousins, J.B. (2009). A review and synthesis of current research on cross-cultural evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation*, *304*(4), 457–494.

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, *43*(6), 1241–1299.

Cuellar Mejia, M., Rodriguez, O., Johnson, H., & Brooks, B. (2018). *Reforming English pathways in California's community colleges*. The Public Policy Institute of California. Retrieved from http://www.ppic.org/wp-content/uploads/r-0217mcr.pdf

Cushman, E. (2016). Decolonizing validity. *Journal of Writing Assessment, 9*(1). http://journalofwritingassessment.org/article.php?article=92

Elliot, N. (2005). *On a scale: A social history of writing assessment in America*. New York, NY: Lang.

Elliot, N. (2016). A theory of ethics for writing assessment. *Journal of Writing Assessment, 9*(1). http://journalofwritingassessment.org/article.php?article=98

Frierson, H.T., Hood, S. & Hughes, G. B. (2002). Strategies that address culturally responsive evaluations. In J. Frechtling (Ed.), *The 2002 user-friendly handbook for project evaluation*. Arlington, Va.: National Science Foundation, 2002.

Galton, F.W. (1869). *Hereditary genius: An inquiry into its laws, and consequences*. New York, NY: MacMillan and Company.

Galton, F.W. (1904). Eugenics: Its definition, scope and aims. *The American Journal of Sociology*, *10*(1).

Gomes, M. (2018). Writing assessment and responsibility for colonialism. In M. Poe, A. B. Inoue, & N. Elliot (Eds.), *Writing assessment, social justice, and the advancement of opportunity* (pp. 201–226). Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.

Gordon Commission. (2013). *To assess, to teach, to learn: A vision for the future of assessment* (Technical Report). https://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/technical_report_executive_summary.pdf

Gordon, E. W. (2020). Toward assessment in the service of learning. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 39*(3), 72–78.

Gould, S.J. (1981). *The mismeasure of man*. New York, NY: Norton

Haswell, R. (2004). Post-secondary entrance writing placement: A brief synopsis of research. *CompPile.Org*. http://comppile.org/profresources/writingplacementresearch.htm

Heiser, C.A., Prince, K., Levy, J. (2017). Examining critical theory as a framework to advance equity through Student Affairs assessment. *Journal of Student Affairs Inquiry*, *3*(1).

Henning, G. & Lundquist, A.E. (2020). The intersection of assessment and equity, inclusion, and decolonization: A model (of transformation and liberation). *NASPA Knowledge Community Publication*. https://naspa.org/files/dmfile/2020KCOnlinePublication.pdf

Hopson, R. K. (2009). Reclaiming knowledge at the margins: Culturally responsive evaluation in the current evaluation moment. In K. Ryan & J.B. Cousins (Eds.), *The Sage international handbook of educational evaluation*, 429–446.

Hood, S., Hopson, R. K., & Kirkhart, K. E. (2015). Culturally responsive evaluation. In K. E. Newcomer, H. P. Hatry, & J. S. Wholey (Eds.), *Handbook of practical program evaluation* (4th Ed.). John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA.

Inoue, A. B. (2015). *Antiracist writing assessment ecologies: Teaching and assessing writing for a socially just future*. Fort Collins, CO, WAC Clearinghouse/Parlor Press.

Kane, M. T. (2006). Validation. In R. L. Brennan (Ed.), *Educational measurement* (4th Ed., pp. 17–64). Westport, CT: American Council on Education/Praeger.

Kane, M.T. (2013). Validating the interpretations and uses of test scores. *Journal of Educational Measurement, 50*, 1-73. https://doi.org/10.1111/jedm.12000

Karabel, J. (2005). *The chosen: The hidden history of admission and exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Kuh, G. D. (2008). *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, *32*(3), 465–491.

Lundquist, A.E., & Heiser, C.A. (2020, August 21). *Practicing equity-centered assessment*. Anthology. https://www.anthology.com/blog/practicing-equity-centered-assessment

McNair, T., Bensimon, E., & Malcom-Piqueux, L. (2020). *From equity talk to equity walk: Expanding practitioner knowledge for racial justice in higher education*. Hoboken, NJ; Jossey-Bass.

Messick, S. (1989). Meaning and values in test validation: The science and ethics of assessment. *Educational Researcher*, *18*(2), 5–11.

Mislevy, R. J. (2018). *Sociocognitive foundations of educational measurement*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Montenegro, E., & Jankowski, N. A. (2017, January). *Equity and assessment: Moving towards culturally responsive assessment*. (Occasional Paper No. 29). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois and Indiana University, National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA). Assessment.

Morante, E. A. (1987). A primer on placement testing. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *1987*(59), 55–63.

Moss, P. A., Pullin, D. C., Gee, J. P., Haertel, E. H. & Young, L. J. (Eds.). (2008). *Assessment, equity, and opportunity to learn*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Nastal, J. (2019). Beyond tradition: Writing placement, fairness, and success at a two-year college. *Journal of Writing Assessment*, *12*(1). http://www.journalofwritingassessment.org/article.php?article=136

National Center for Education Statistics. (2016). Table 326.10. Graduation rate from first institution attended for first-time, full-time bachelor's degree- seeking students at 4-year postsecondary institutions, by race/ethnicity, time to completion, sex, control of institution, and acceptance rate: Selected cohort entry years, 1996 through 2009. Retrieved from: https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d16/tables/dt16_326.10.asp

Nicholas, M.C., & Slotnick, R.C. (2018, April). *A portrait of the assessment professional in the United States: Results from a national survey*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois and Indiana University, National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA). http://learningoutcomesassessment.org/occasionalpaperthirtyfour.html

Oliveri, M.E., Nastal, J., & Slomp, D. (2020). Articulating equity-centered design. *ETS Research Reports*. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/ets2.12307

Palomba, C. and Banta, T.W. (1999). *Assessment essentials: Planning, implementing, and improving assessment in higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher*, *41*(3), 93–97.

Patel, L. (2016). *Decolonizing educational research: From ownership to answerability*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Pellegrino, J. W. (2020). Important considerations for assessment to function in the service of education. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, *39*(3), 81–85.

Pellegrino, J. W., Chudowsky, N., & Glaser, R. (2001). *Knowing what students know: The science and design of educational assessment*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Rawls, J. (1999). *A theory of justice* (Rev. Ed). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1971)

Royster, J. J., & Kirsch, G. E. (2012). *Feminist rhetorical practices: New horizons for rhetoric, composition, and literacy studies*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

SenGupta, S., Hopson, R., & Thompson-Robinson, M. (2004). Cultural competence in evaluation: An overview. *New Directions for Evaluation*, *102*, 5–19.

Singer-Freeman, K., & Robinson, C. (2020, November). *Grand challenges in assessment: Collective issues in need of solutions* (Occasional Paper No. 47). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois and Indiana University, National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment.

Steele, C. M. (1997). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. *American Psychologist*, *52*(6), 613–629.

Symonette, H. (2004). Walking pathways toward becoming a culturally competent evaluator: Boundaries, borderlands, and border crossings. *New Directions for Evaluation*, *2004*(102), 95–109.

Training School at Vineland New Jersey. (1916). *The development of intelligence in children*. H.Goddard, (Ed). Baltimore, MD: Williams & Wilkins Company.

Tuhiwai Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous practices*. New York, NY: Zed Books.

Zenderland, L. (1998). *Measuring minds: Henry Herbert Goddard and the origins of American intelligence testing*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Zerquera, D., Reyes, K. A., Pender, J. T., & Abbady, R. (2018). Understanding practitioner-driven assessment and evaluation efforts for social justice. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, *2018*(177), 15-40.

About the Authors

Dr. Shannon Milligan is the Director of Student Affairs Assessment, Evaluation, and Organizational Development at University of California, San Diego in La Jolla, California and can be reached at: smilligan@ucsd.edu

Dr. Terrel Rhodes is a Distinguished Fellow at the Association of American Colleges and Universities in Washington, D.C. and can be reached at: rhodes@aacu.org

Dr. Renata Opoczynski is the Assistant Dean for Student Success Assessment and Strategic Initiatives at Michigan State University in East Lansing, Michigan and can be reached at: opoczyns@msu.edu

Dr. Jessica Nastal is an Associate Professor in the Department of English and Center for Teaching and Learning at Prairie State College in Chicago Heights, Illinois and can be reached at: jnastaldema@prairiestate.edu

Dr. Ciji Heiser is the Director of Assessment and Effectiveness at Western Michigan University in Kalamazoo, Michigan and can be reached at: ciji.heiser@wmich.edu

Dr. Moreen Carvan is an Associate Professor at Rosalind Franklin University of Medicine and Science in North Chicago, Illinois and can be reached at: moreen.carvan@rosalindfranklin.edu

Appendix
Equity in Assessment Workgroup Membership

- Ciji Ann Heiser, Ph.D., Director of Assessment and Effectiveness for Student Affairs, Western Michigan University
- Ellen Peters, Associate Provost, Institutional Research, Planning and Student Success
- Ereka R. Williams, Associate Dean for Education, Quality Assurance and Community Engagement, Winston-Salem State University
- Eric Riedel, Dean of Nursing, CECT, and Online Learning Excellence, Century College
- George Still, Director of Assessment - Student Affairs, University of North Carolina at Greensboro
- Glenn Phillips, Director of Assessment, Howard University
- Heather M. Pleasants, Educational Consultant and Senior Assessment Specialist, Faculty Innovation Center, University of Texas at Austin
- Jessica Nastal, PhD, Associate Professor of English and Coordinator of the Center for Teaching and Learning, Prairie State College: Predominantly Black Institution, Emerging Hispanic Serving Institution, two-year college
- Joel D. Bloom, Director of Assessment, Hunter College, CUNY
- Kimberly Long, Learning Designer, LRNG powered by Southern New Hampshire University
- Kimberly Thompson, Director of Assessment, Mesa Community College
- Krishna Dunston, Director of Outcomes Assessment, Delaware County Community College
- Maniphone Dickerson, Division Dean for Business and Workforce Development, Evergreen Valley College
- Matthew McKay, Senior Associate Director, Rochester Institute of Technology
- Moreen Carvan, Sr. Associate VP for Academic Affairs, Rosalind Franklin University of Medicine and Science
- Renata Opoczynski, Assistant Dean of Student Success Assessment and Strategic Initiatives, Michigan State University
- Rowanna Carpenter, Director of Assessment, Portland State University
- Shannon Milligan, Ph.D., Director of Student Affairs Assessment, Evaluation, and Organizational Development, University of California, San Diego
- Sosanya Jones, Assistant Professor, Educational Leadership & Policy Studies, Howard University
- Terry Rhodes, Vice President, Office of Quality, Curriculum, and Assessment and Executive Director of VALUE, Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U)