California State University East Bay
Committee on Academic Planning and Review
Minutes of Subcommittee on Institutional Learning Outcomes
May 7, 2018 – 2:00 – 3:50 PM, SA 1400

Present: Martin Castillo (Co-Curricular Programs), Patrick Huang (CSCI), Sandy Luong (CBE), Jen Nguyen (SCAA), Sarah Nielsen (CLASS), Sharon Radcliff (LIB), Balaraman Rajan (CBE), Julie Stein (EEP Manager), Nancy White (CEAS), Caron Inouye (GE)

Absent: Jason Smith (CAPR Chair), Jodi Servatius (CEAS)

1. Welcome and Announcements

2. Approval of Agenda – Approved, with addition of announcements about the GE Assessment Subcommittee. (M/S) Luong/Inouye.

3. Volunteer Secretary – Nguyen.


   The 4/16/2018 Volunteer Secretary (Nielsen) did not have notes ready for this meeting. Nielsen offered to send out the 4/16/2018 notes before the next meeting on 5/21/2018.

5. Updates on ILO committee governance
   - Stein reported that the ILO Information Literacy rubric went to the Academic Senate on April 17, 2018 for a first read. There was a lot of excitement about the rubric on the Senate floor! There was an amendment to the ILO Information Literacy rubric that was suggested by Jason Smith, the Committee on Academic Planning and Review (CAPR) Chair. The suggested amendment was for the criterion “Gather” to include “library resources” as a sample search strategy. The leadership felt strongly about this addition. No major concerns about this amendment were expressed by the members of the ILO subcommittee.

6. Updates on GE Assessment Subcommittee
   - Inouye announced that a General Education (GE) Assessment Subcommittee was created. This is a subcommittee of CAPR. The Committee on Instruction and Curriculum (CIC)’s GE subcommittee will continue to approve GE courses. However, the GE Assessment Subcommittee will be responsible for the assessment of approved courses. This type of assessment has never been done before nor are there GE-specific Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs).
   - Inouye reported that the membership of the GE Assessment Subcommittee will be as follows: A representative from each college, 1 representative from CAPR, 1 representative from the GE subcommittee, 1 representative from the ILO subcommittee. Members may be able to serve on multiple committees/subcommittees.
• Luong expressed concerned about the scope of the GE Assessment Subcommittee’s work – it would be doing a lot! Stein clarified that the GE Assessment Subcommittee would not be assessing all of GE, just a sample of courses.

• Stein said that the schedule of the GE Assessment Subcommittee will align as much as possible with the ILO subcommittee’s schedule. For example, next year will be the “year of written communication”.

• Stein clarified that, since GE requires its own set of outcomes, the GE Assessment Subcommittee will be creating its own set of rubrics. The ILO and GE Assessment rubrics may inform one another, but they will not be the same. The justification is that the outcomes/competencies for a student after their first year may be different than the outcomes/competencies expected of students upon graduation/full mastery.

• Nielsen elaborated that the first-year writing courses have additional alignment requirements – specifically to the CSU Executive Order (EO) 1110.

• Castillo expressed concerns that we do not have an initial entry benchmark of where our students are. This is very problematic because we lose students after the first and second years.

7. ILO Written Communication and Information Literacy Assignment Guide (brief updates)

• Stein sent out updated versions of the ILO Written Communication and Information Literacy Assignment Guides via e-mail. These documents contain 2 pages that describe the rubric, questions to consider, and annotated assignments. Stein suggested that that the last ILO Subcommittee meeting be spent on updates to these documents.

8. ILO Quantitative Reasoning assessment discussion continued on questions, issues that came up during QR assessment

Rajan reminded subcommittee members that if they were not comfortable assessing certain criteria on the ILO Quantitative Reasoning rubric, they should not hesitate to select the “0”/”NA” option.

Inouye expressed concerns that some assignment instructions were unclear and did not specifically outline certain criterion in their assignments. As a result, it was difficult to assess some assignments. Huang reminded subcommittee members to reference the “ILO Quantitative Reasoning Assessment Project Faculty Assignment Alignments to Rubric” document that specifies when a faculty member opts out of a criterion for their assignment.

Inouye observed that for assignments submitted in subjects like biochemistry, it is difficult to assess the quality of visualizations, graphs, etc. if the assessor is not familiar with the content. Castillo agreed with this statement remarking that he did not want to give “0’s”/”NA’s” to everything. Castillo wanted to “assess something” and sometimes defaulted to assessing based on thoroughness. Huang remarked that “0’s”/”NA’s” are valuable information too.
There was a discussion about whether it was possible to make an assessment of criteria such as “Implications” and “Interpretation” if there is not enough information/context to assess “Quantitative Analysis” since all criteria build upon one another. Rajan remarked that one could still assess “Implications” or “Interpretation” even without a solid understanding of “Quantitative Analysis”. Huang asked how to assess when two students come up with different answers for “Quantitative Analysis”, which could affect/lead to two different answers under “Interpretation”. The conclusion was that if an assessor does not know what to do in a situation, a “0” or “NA” would be a sufficient assessment response.

Castillo expressed a concern about what a “0”/”NA” could mean in this process. If we mark “0”, it does not necessarily mean that the rubric is bad. Stein responded that that there is already a very strong benchmark of work and enough information from participating faculty members to get a full picture of how effective our rubrics are.

Stein remarked that among subcommittee members who have submitted their evaluations, the criterion that subcommittee members had the lowest confidence in was “Quantitative Analysis”. The criterion that subcommittee members had the highest confidence in was “Overall Communication”.

Huang described his rationale for when a “0” or “NA” felt appropriate. Huang said one should be able to argue why a student was given a “1”, “2”, “3” or “4”. A response “looking good” may not be sufficient enough to warrant a rating beyond “0” or “NA”.

Results of the subcommittee’s evaluations will be aggregated by the next meeting on May 21, 2018. Julia Olkin of the Math Department and Fanny Yeung of Institutional Research will be result to discuss the results.

Rajan remarked how confounding it is for computers with Windows and that which is linked to the projector to not have Microsoft Office installed. It doesn’t make sense. Everyone agreed.

9. ILO Quantitative Reasoning assessment due by Tuesday, May 8th.

10. Adjournment
   • The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Next meeting: Monday, May 21st, 2:00 PM – 3:50 PM.