California State University, East Bay
Committee on Academic Planning and Review
Minutes of Subcommittee on Institutional Learning Outcomes
February 20, 2017, SA 1400, 2:00pm - 3:50pm

Present: Martin Castillo, Helen Christian, Patrick Huang, Sarah Nielsen, Aline Soules, Julie Stein, Sandy Luong, Balaraman Rajan, Nancy White

Absent: Caron Inouye, Jason Smith

Guests: Jodi Servatius, Fanny Yeung

1. Approval of agenda. M/S (White/Rajan). Amendments added item 5 and 6. All approved.


3. Update on diversity ILO assessment/BB Outcomes.
   a. Blackboard Outcomes issues and possible solutions were discussed. See attached.
   b. Committee members decided on Option 1 and 3, based on Yeung’s recommendation.

4. Discussion of quantitative reasoning rubric and process.
   a. Concerns about the instructor assessing their own student artifacts came up, due to bias about their students and the differences in assessing vs. grading, which require training. A few ideas were proposed:
      i. Gather pool of reviewers who teach upper division course that align QR rubric.
      ii. Two assessors: the instructor of the course and one from the same department or related discipline.
      iii. Assessing B6 courses would allow cross-disciplinary faculty/staff to assess student artifacts, whereas the QR rubric could be used rather for program assessment. Therefore, GE courses and ILOs would align better in ILO assessments.
      iv. The faculty committee who developed the QR rubric could try and assess a B6 course using the rubric to try and simplify for ILO purposes.
   b. Stein and Servatius may contact WASC, to ask about other campuses with other QR rubrics, think about budget and timing, estimate load (pilot: 10 courses, at institutional level, 2-3 classes per college). This discussion will continue at next meeting.

5. Discussion of validity issues with ILO assessment process so far.
   a. Plagiarism may be a problem in sample. Could develop procedures for flagging plagiarism and use SafeAssign or Turnitin. Using the comments field to note suspected plagiarism could be first step.

REMAINING WINTER MEETING:

- March 6th, SA1400. Review information literacy rubric. Guest: Stephanie Alexander, lead from information literacy rubric project

Meeting adjourned at 3:46pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Helen Christian
Inter-rater Reliability Report for Blackboard Outcomes

Problem:

Any time more than one evaluator scores a sample of student work, there is the potential for discrepancies between the evaluators’ scores. Currently, it is difficult to identify where there are discrepancies, how big those discrepancies are, and it is impossible to bring in an additional evaluator to an existing collection.

This need exists at both at the overall rubric and the rubric row levels.

Potential Solutions:

We’ll break this down in to two separate pieces: identifying where there are differences between evaluators’ scores on a sample of student work and adding additional evaluations to rectify or resolve the initial scoring. These will be separate deliverables with separate timelines for delivery. At this time, we are focused on the Inter-Rater Reliability statistics and will approach the need to bring in additional evaluators once the reporting is in place.

First, we could add inter-rater reliability statistics to the existing Excel report. Here, we would be able to provide IRR statistics at both the rubric row and overall rubric levels.

Second, we could add a column to display IRR statistics to the Evaluate tab of a collection, shown here:

On this screen we would show the IRR value only for the overall rubric score. To this point in
our research, there does not appear to be a clear place to display IRR values at the rubric row level.

A third option would be to create an entirely new report that provides a view of IRR values both at the overall rubric and at the individual rubric row level. If you have preferences about how a new report of this type would be structured, accessed, etc., I would love to take that input to our Design and Engineering teams.