1. Welcome and introductions.

2. Approval of the agenda. M/S/P to approve agenda (Rajan/Perry). Agenda approved.

3. Approval of minutes from 07 March 2016. M/S/P to approve minutes (Soules/Rajan). Minutes approved.

4. Standard setting for diversity ILO (Dr. Sarah Taylor, Department of Social Work)

Taylor provided background of Diversity rubric. In 2013, Diversity rubric was developed by FLC. In a previous version, the rubric included a social justice component and an N/A column to address criteria not included in an assignment. Discussion came up around implications of rating 1 or 0 for not applicable criteria. Discussion tabled

Soules noted that having consistent language across all rubrics should be considered, as the Diversity rubric uses “sophisticated” “adequate” “limited” “little or no”, and definitions of “worldviews”. Stein reviewed purpose of ILO rubrics in aligning program learning outcomes and departments choosing two ILOs as secondary assessments.

Taylor noted that assignment chosen for assessment should be aligned to rubric, which may apply better to capstone courses that may require components similar in the rubric.

Review of first paper. Discussion around the challenges of reading papers from various disciplines: Luong noted the balance of rubric if applied to all colleges. Nielsen suggested qualitative data could be collected for measuring diversity competency on campus. Taylor suggested having a catalogue of examples from different disciplines for each rating and criteria. Stein suggested faculty groups could do standard setting within their own departments with the rubric, and determine disciplinary interpretations of the rubric.

Review of second paper. Rajan asked about definition of “worldviews”. Taylor noted the original rubric came with an attached glossary. Stein will send glossary to members. The glossary cannot be added easily into the evaluation feature in Blackboard.

Further consideration for the committee: disciplinary interpretations of rubrics, criteria for quality assignments that produce appropriate writing samples to be assessed by ILO rubric (when
out of pilot stage), and clarification of language in Diversity rubric, such as “working through” and “worldview”. Taylor suggested having core questions for each criteria in Diversity rubric.

5. Live scoring
Committee members will score at least 8 papers by next meeting on April 18, 2:00pm-3:50pm, in SA 1400.

Meeting ended at 3:51pm

Respectfully submitted,

Helen Ly