1. Welcome and Announcements

2. Approval of Agenda - (M/S) Nielsen/White

3. Volunteer Secretary - White

4. Approval of Minutes
   Approval of 4/16/2018 minutes: (M/S) White/Nielsen
   Approval of 5/7/18 minutes: (M/S) Nielsen/White

5. Updates
   No updates reported

6. ILO Quantitative Reasoning Assessment Results and Recommendations
   Stein reviewed how the Quantitative Reasoning Rubric was developed by a group of faculty. Seven faculty members piloted the rubric. Three of those faculty members elected to use all seven of the rubric criteria. For the rubric criteria not selected by faculty, N/A was used by assessors.

   The ILO Subcommittee members agreed to use N/A for areas of the rubric they felt least confident assessing. This work-around was used rather than abandoning the pilot when it became clear some areas were difficult for non-disciplinary faculty to assess for accuracy (for most this included representation and quantitative reasoning). The use of N/A by the ILO Subcommittee members created a challenge in terms of data analysis. The artifacts randomly selected by Blackboard Outcomes for the assessment conducted by the disciplinary faculty were not the same as the artifacts assessed by ILO Subcommittee members, which meant comparisons between the two different assessments were not meaningful.

   Olkin felt that the results of the assessment show that ILO Subcommittee members should not evaluate quantitative reasoning. She suggested that the assessment be conducted by disciplinary faculty, or that a team approach be used - with one disciplinary faculty member and one ILO Subcommittee member. The group discussed
having only disciplinary faculty conduct the assessment for more meaningful results, even with the concern about bias related to faculty assessing the work of their students.

Smith mentioned one approach to remove the problem of bias - to bring in a group of students, ask them to complete a math problem and assess their work. The issue with this approach could be students would have no buy in, it would not be the same as a high pressure assignment being graded in a capstone class. Inouye brought up the possibility of using a validated test with nationally normed data to provide us with more information about what students know, and what they lack. Olkin stated that real-life problem resolution, where a student pulls every aspect of quantitative reasoning together with more comprehensive details, would not be possible to assess using a multiple choice test.

The options discussed for the rubric and future assessment of Quantitative Reasoning:
   a. Revise the rubric, setting aside the issue of accuracy and have ILO Subcommittee members participate in the assessment.
   b. Separate the rubric into two parts, one section for disciplinary experts and another for ILO Subcommittee members to assess.
   c. Keep the rubric the same and change who is assessing student work. Disciplinary faculty did not suggest any changes to the rubric.

Members felt that the third option is best, having disciplinary faculty conduct the assessment. Compensation should be suggested for disciplinary faculty to assess QR, perhaps in the first year and then in the next five year cycle.

7. Adjournment
   The meeting was adjourned at 3:57 p.m. M/S (White/Nielsen).

Next meeting: Monday, June 4, 2:00 to 3:50 p.m.