

### Expanding Our Boundaries in Assessment

“We cannot become *what we want to be* by remaining *what we are*.” - Max DePree

“As we conclude 2020, we find ourselves looking into the new year with a sense of hope. We hope that the pandemic will abate with the distribution of new vaccines. We hope that we can rebuild much of what we have lost. We hope that we can return to some sense of normalcy. Yet, as we kindle this hope, we would also be wise to consider how we might use this time to continue expanding our practices outside of what has been “traditional” in our work. While we might indeed be able to return to the same pre-pandemic practices in higher education, that doesn’t mean we must or that we should. Let us all take time to consider what we might do to improve our work and what we might add to our toolkit as we step back into our physical world. This issue of RPA includes seven peer reviewed articles that address a variety issues in our field that might encourage us to expand our boundaries.

Smith and Finney provide compelling rationale for considering the impact of program theory and implementation fidelity in our work; providing a meaningful example through an ethical reasoning program. Chase shares her work exploring how students can be more involved in classroom-level assessment and the numerous benefits that might accrue from such a practice. Jones and Phillips provide a lens for considering how traditional theories underlying many program review practices may undermine diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts, particularly at HBCUs. Clark, Luo, and Smith examine the effectiveness of and provide recommendations for embedding a dedicated writing assessor while allowing faculty to focus on disciplinary content. Singer-Freeman and Robinson detail their work to explore grand challenges in higher education assessment and provide some insight into their ongoing work on how to begin addressing those challenges. Davis, Biddle, and Hall share their work to examine faculty member experiences with internal processes within the program review process. Finally, Tucker, Drummound, and Ostro orsky provide an account of their experience developing and working with a rubric for program-level assessment plans and reports.

I hope this issue of *Research & Practice in Assessment* provides you with some inspiration as you seek to expand your professional boundaries in the new year.

Regards,

*Nicholas Curtis*

Editor-in-Chief,  
*Research & Practice in Assessment*

