ILO Subcommittee Meeting Notes (DRAFT)
April 16, 2018 – 2:00 pm – 3:50 pm
SA 1400

ILO Subcommittee Members Present: Patrick Huang (CSCI), Sandy Luong (CBE), Jen Nguyen (SCAA), Sarah Nielsen (CLASS), Sharon Radcliff (LIB), Balaraman Rajan (CBE), Julie Stein (Educational Effectiveness Project Manager), Nancy White (CEAS)
ILO Subcommittee Members Absent: Martin Castillo (Co-Curricular Program), Caron Inouye (GE)

1. Approval of Agenda: M: Nielsen S: Luong/Vote Y: 8 N: 0 A: 0

2. Approval of Minutes: M: White S: Nguyen/Vote Y: 8 N:0 A: 1

3. Volunteer secretary for April 16th ILO Subcommittee meeting: Nielsen

4. Updates on ILO committee governance from Julie Stein

The ILO Information Literacy rubric was approved by ExCom 4/10/18 and will be reviewed by Senate 4/17/18. Stephanie Alexander, library faculty who led the ILO rubric development, plans to attend the senate meeting to field any questions.

The ILO Long Term Assessment Plan was passed by Senate on 4/3/18.

In fall 18, 26 faculty members will be identified to take part in ILO assessment for written communication and information literacy. Communication about this assessment will be largely through the associate deans in each college and the library.

5. ILO Written Communication and Information Literacy Assignment Guide updates

For the written communication assignment guide, Stein added examples for each criterion on the rubric, and Nielsen’s annotation of a full assignment will be reformatted to be easier to print and share in other formats.

For the information literacy assignment guide, Stein, Radcliff, and Alexander will model their approach on the draft of the one for written communication.

6. ILO Quantitative Reasoning assessment discussion

Rajan led a discussion about the committee’s experiences with applying the quantitative reasoning (QR) rubric to student artifacts collected for the pilot. The main points that came up in the discussion are summarized below.

Members commented on the quality of the assignments aligned to the rubric, but also expressed concern
about a lack of confidence in many their scores. The accuracy category caused the most concern. Quantitative analysis and limitations were other rubric categories that committee members raised concerns about. Most felt more confident in scoring the interpretations, implications, and overall communication categories on the rubric.

Some of the hand-written artifacts were hard to read.

Some members reported that they gained confidence as they had more experience scoring a particular assignment. Norming to particular prompts might be helpful moving forward. Another suggestion was to assume that the student’s approach and calculations were accurate, but concerns were raised about this way of scoring as it would produce inaccurate assessment results. A third suggestion was to ask participating faculty to provide an expected response for each assignment that could be included during the standard setting for using the QR rubric. This suggestion was found to impractical because there are often multiple processes/approaches that can be used to arrive at tenable results and analysis.

Concerns were also raised about how disciplinary faculty would feel about QR pilot results where the ILO Subcommittee lacked confidence in their scores. After some discussion, the committee agreed it was important to be transparent and engage in honest dialog with the QR rubric development team. Fanny Yeung will also compare the ILO Subcommittee scores with the QR faculty scores to help with this dialog.

The subcommittee considered the question of whether we should end the QR pilot assessment now before having scored all our assigned artifacts. After some discussion, members agree to finish QR assessment, but use N/A when a member was not confident about a score for one or more categories on the rubric. With this in mind, members were asked to re-score the artifacts they had already scored and complete all scoring for this pilot no later than May 8.

After the QR pilot scoring is complete, the committee will need to decide whether we recommend that QR function like other ILO rubrics or if it will need to be more program-based assessment.

Given the complications with the QR pilot, the subcommittee agreed that we would postpone the oral communication pilot until fall 2018.

7. Starting at 3:00pm, committee members continued their assessment of the quantitative reasoning ILO.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50pm.