California State University, East Bay  
Committee on Academic Planning and Review  
Minutes of Subcommittee on Institutional Learning Outcomes  
November 23, 2015, LI 2250, 12:00PM – 2:00PM

Present: Kenneth Curr, Tamra Donnelly, Helen Ly, Sarah Nielsen, Brian Perry, Aline Soules, Julie Stein, Nancy White  
Absent: Balaraman Rajan

1. Welcome and introductions: Nancy White joined ILO Subcommittee to represent CEAS.

2. Approval of the agenda: M/S/P (Soules/Curr) to approve agenda. Discussion of ILO Rubric moved as next topic of discussion until 2016.

3. Discussion of ILO rubric development and piloting schedule: Soules noted that aligning GE requirements with ILOs important for next year. Stein noted that GE Subcommittee may not be as familiar with ILOs. Nielsen noted representation from ILO Subcommittee by Soules and herself. Committee will review the proposed schedule in winter 2016.

4. Approval of minutes from 26 October 2015: All in favor of approval. Donnelly and White abstained.

5. Setting winter meeting and assessment schedules: 1st and 3rd Mondays, 2:00pm – 4:00pm to complement GE Subcommittee meetings starting on February 1, 2016. Winter 2014 readings held 134 assessments with 13 papers per reader. Donnelly asked about considering emeriti faculty to serve as readers for upcoming Written Communication ILO assessment readings. Nielsen and Stein noted possibly working with Jodie Servatius to serve as reader. Stein will reserve computer lab for standard setting 3-5 papers and possibly live scoring as a group. The rest of the papers will be scored on committee members’ own time. Nielsen and Stein could send papers before February 1 standard setting date.

6. Approval of critical thinking rubric: Under “Statement of Position,” the word “valid” was added, and criteria revised to “States a clear position that is valid, original, and/or innovative, as appropriate.” M/S/P (Curr/Perry) approved. Soules abstain.

7. Schedule of next ILO rubric: Stein proposed model of developing next ILO rubric, using campus representatives as expert consults with 3-4 meetings during one quarter. Development and pilot of rubric would need to be led by expert for continuity as the rubric evolves, as expert could be consulted during and in between rubric development meetings.

Adjourned 1:03pm
Respectfully submitted,

Helen Ly