ILO Subcommittee
Meeting Minutes
April 2, 2018 – 2:00 pm – 3:50 pm
SA 1400

ILO Subcommittee Members: Patrick Huang (CSCI), Sandy Luong (CBE), Jen Nguyen (SCAA), Sharon Radcliff (LIB), Balaraman Rajan (CBE), Julie Stein (Educational Effectiveness Project Manager), Sarah Nielsen (CLASS),

1. Welcome and Announcements

2. Approval of Agenda – Approved.

3. Volunteer secretary for April 2nd ILO Subcommittee meeting – Sandy Luong.

4. Approval of minutes from March 5, 2018 – Approved.

5. Updates on ILO committee governance
   a. Julie Updates:
      i. Approved by ILO Subcommittee only
      ii. Rubrics are not changing in CAPR
      iii. ILO Long Term Assessment Plan, 2nd read, Senate April 3rd

6. ILO Quantitative Reasoning Standard Setting
   a. Standard Setting – Practice to establish common understanding and applying of rubric
   b. Julie Recap of Training and Assessment Sessions
      i. Bala provided feedback on way rubric worked for disciplinary assessment
      ii. Faculty assessed what they graded
      iii. General consensus believed no way non-disciplinary assessors can conduct assessment, however, many reversed their opinions at the end of the session and believed that it would be possible for non-disciplined assessors to conduct the assessment.

7. ILO Quantitative Reasoning assessment Discussion
   a. Question for ILO Subcommittee: Can non-disciplinary assess?
   b. Note: New assessment score column consisting of “0,” which would mean n/a
   c. Committee reviewed rubric prior to conducting assessment
      i. Discussed interpretation and understanding of each rubric criteria.
         1. Problem Formulation
         2. Representation/Visualization
            a. How to assess when there are no tables/graphs? What about answers in narrative text format?
b. Possibly change ‘depiction’ to ‘discussion’ in the future

3. **Quantitative Analysis**
   a. May be the most difficult to assess
   b. Most technical aspect of rubric

4. **Interpretation**
   a. Can they say this is what they got and this is what it means?
   b. How to decipher between analysis and interpretation
      i. Analysis = quantitative
      ii. Interpretation = verbal explanation of quantitative result. Looking at the meaning of the math
   c. May be related to discipline

5. **Implications**
   a. Looking at broader impact of the result (in contrast to Interpretation)
   b. What is the extension of the quantitative result?
   c. This criteria is not quantitative

6. **Limitations**
   a. What prevented them from running a more extensive analysis
      i. I.e. limitations of methods, results, data available

7. **Overall Communication**
   a. Assessing whether you have to read between the lines? Are you able to follow what the student is writing?
   b. May have to be done by disciplinary specialist

8. **ILO Quantitative Reasoning assessment**
   a. Committee members to conduct first assessment of assignment sample #1
      i. **Comments on Representation/Visualization:**
         1. Member scores varied from 1 to 4
         2. Accuracy may be something we may or may not evaluate
         3. Answer key to define set perimeter?
         4. We are not using accuracy – numbers do not really mean anything because we cannot evaluate accuracy
         5. Even discipline faculty had questions regarding accuracy
         6. Should we assume data is accurate or should we remove word ‘accuracy’ from the rubric?
         7. For the pilot, assume what the data presented is accurate; assess based on display and presentation of data
      ii. **Comments on Quantitative Analysis:**
         1. Use of regression model hinted in assignment prompt
         2. Most scored a 3
      iii. **Comments on Interpretation:**
         1. Student was able to interpret results of the quantitative analysis
         2. Use of “no brainer” and “obvious” were indications that the narrative was not an interpretation.
3. Scores were consistently on the higher side among members.
4. Quantity of interpretations – How do you differentiate between number vs. accuracy of interpretations.

iv. Comments on Implication:
   1. Student kept implication closer to problem, resulting in 3 score.

v. Comments on Overall Communication:
   1. High score due to overall communication of data throughout the paper.
   2. Are you able to follow the student’s argument?
   3. Inconsistency of units would be ignored when assessing the overall communication.

b. Committee members to conduct first assessment of assignment sample #2

   i. Comments on Representation/Visualization:
      1. Member scores: 4(4 members), 3(2 members), 2(1 member)
      2. (4 raters) Tables were set up nicely, equations could also be used as representation/visualization
      3. (3 raters) Units were presented unclearly
      4. (2 rater) Screen shot was insignificant, no units used, terminology issues

   ii. Comments on Quantitative Analysis:
      1. Member scores: 4(4 members), 3 (4 members)
      2. (4 raters)
      3. (3 raters) Was mean really appropriate?

   iii. Comments on Interpretation:
      1. Member scores: 4(1 members), 3(4 members), 2(3 members)
      2. (3 raters) Should have been more interpretation. Repetitive statements.
      3. (2 raters) Couldn’t understand what numbers meant. Did not go into as much detail as sample 1. Errors in interpretation. No interpretation of p-values, r-squared.

   iv. Comments on Implication:
      1. Member scores: 4(1 member), 3(3 members), 2(2 member), 1(2 members)
      2. (4 rater) Missed broader context – mixed up implications with interpretations.
      3. (1 rater) No illusions to the real world.

   v. Comments on Overall Communication:
      1. Member scores: 4(2 members), 3(3 members), 2(2 members)
      2. (3 raters) What was stated was concise.
      3. (2 raters) Everything was about one point. Nothing was said before and nothing was said after.

c. Overall Comments:
   i. Accuracy issues – should we revise the rubric for a non-disciplinary group of assessors?
   ii. What does it mean to do in-discipline assessment?
9. Individual Committee Member Assessment
   a. Everyone has about 13 assignments – Link sent in email.
   b. How should we assess?
      i. Everyone assess 4 assignments each.

10. ILO Written Communication and Information Literacy Assignment Guide (brief updates)
    a. Sarah to provide feedback offline.

11. Meeting adjourned.