1. **Welcome and introductions**: All members introduced themselves. Nielsen asked for recommendations for 2 vacant seats: 1 seat from Co-Curricular Programs and 1 seat from CEAS. Nielsen suggested Nancy White from CEAS. Ly suggested Jessika Murphy of the Diversity and Inclusion Student Center. Stein suggested Sarah Taylor or Margaret Harris.

2. **Approval of Agenda**: M/S/P (all) to approve the agenda. No revisions.

3. **Approval of minutes from 11 May 2015**: M/S/P (all) to approve the minutes as submitted.


6. **Winter quarter assessment of written communication ILO**
   a. **Organizing winter assessment sessions** (2-3 shorter sessions or one longer session?) Soules opposed long sessions, as they may not be as effective. Perry agreed. Stein pointed out the benefit of dialogue around standard setting in a longer session, and that many assessors did not finish their assigned papers in time during the previous assessment session for Critical Thinking. Members were in favor of shorter sessions, but schedule of sessions will be tabled for next meeting.

   b. **Standard-setting approach**. Rajan suggested compromising with an initial standard setting discussion with assessing 2-3 papers during a meeting time, assess 4-5 during own time, and coming back as a group to discuss the process. Then the rest of the assignments could be assessed consistently based on these two standard-setting discussions. Rajan also brought up the issue with interrater reliability, in cases in which some assignments did not apply neatly into the Critical Thinking ILO rubric, yet some assessors gave a score or did not score at all. Stein previously consulted WASC visitor and Fanny Yeung, and pointed out that there will always be a certain amount of internal inconsistency with this type of assessment. Stein will check with Fanny about whether to choose a 1 or 0 for assignment components that do not match the ILO rubric. Ly asked whether agreement between members on matching components of assignments and ILO rubric could be reached during standard setting conversations.
7. **Approval of critical thinking rubric**: Soules pointed out that “Statement of Position” descriptions should be changed to “States a clear position that is valid, original, and/or innovative, as appropriate,” especially when referring to assignments in the sciences, such as Biology. Curr agreed. Voting on this revision will be tabled for next meeting, in which Stein will report back on APGS opinion on this revision.

8. **ILO rubric development and piloting**: Stein gave overview of Draft ILO Rubric Development plan. Soules pointed out Information Literacy may not fit neatly under one ILO. Stein suggests using plan to decide which rubrics need to be developed next, based on Semester Conversion timeline and other university priorities. Members will consider and return with comments at next meeting.

Adjourn 1:39 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Helen Ly