California State University, East Bay
Committee on Academic Planning and Review
Minutes of Subcommittee on Institutional Learning Outcomes
March 7, 2016, SA 1400, 2:00PM – 3:50PM

Members present: Kenneth Curr, Sandy Luong, Helen Ly, Sarah Nielsen, Brian Perry, Balaraman Rajan, Aline Soules, Julie Stein, Nancy White

Guests: Fanny Yeung, Meg Taggart, Jodi Servatius

A. Approval of agenda. M/S/P (Soules, Rajan). M/S/P (Soules/Perry) changes approved to add 16-17 Assessment Project Timeline to agenda.

B. Approval of minutes from 15 February 2016. M/S/P to approve minutes (Stein/Soules). Curr and Luong abstained.

C. Written communication ILO assessment

a. Fall 2014, fall 2015 written communication assessment results (APGS Research Manager, Dr. Fanny Yeung)

Yeung’s analysis of scores used a score of 3 to rate competency. On average, student papers scored higher in audience awareness (3.10), on par with competency rating in statement of purpose (3.01), and lower in organization Cohesion and Clarity (2.83), Presentation of Supporting Ideas (2.8), Language Usage and Sentence Structure (2.77), and Mechanics (2.79).

Rajan noted that although “Language Usage and Sentence Structure” and “Mechanics” are rated separately, the scores averages remain similar. Metrics in the future could combine both to simplify visualization of data. Nielsen noted that WST and first-tier portfolio data also combine both.

Yeung also noted that readers’ scores were more consistent than the pilot assessment of Critical Thinking, with the majority of readers having 0-1 point difference between their scores.

Discussion around appropriate criteria for assignments used in ILO assessments in Fall 2018. This will be a future consideration for the committee.

Stein will ask faculty participants for permission to post Yeung’s powerpoint on the ILO Subcommittee website.

b. Discussion: reflections on process and meaning/implications of results + initial thoughts on closing the loop (3:06pm)
The committee overall agreed that using Blackboard to grade was efficient, as technical issues have been resolved. Soules noted that student anonymity remains important when out of pilot phase.

Nielsen noted that instructors could give a blurb to explain their assignment in more context. Although assignments prompts may have improved from Critical Thinking pilot assessment, some assignments needed clarification.

Stein noted that these results may be shared with the Writing Skills Subcommittee.

**D. Confirm spring meetings (all in SA 1400)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 4</td>
<td>2-4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 18</td>
<td>2-4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2</td>
<td>2-4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 16</td>
<td>2-4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 6</td>
<td>2-4pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E. 2016-7 assessment project timeline**

Stein: Next rubrics are: quantitative reasoning, oral communication, and information literacy. Julia Olkin and Julie McNamara to develop QR rubric in Fall 2016.

Sarah Taylor will come to first meeting to help the committee use the Diversity rubric on April 4.

**F. Review diversity rubric**

No copies. Committee will read rubric, make notes, and bring questions for next meeting.

Meeting adjourned 3:51pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Helen Ly