California State University East Bay  
Committee on Academic Planning and Review  
Minutes of Subcommittee on Institutional Learning Outcomes  
August 27, 2018 – 2:00 – 3:50 PM, SF 0466

Present: Jen Nguyen (SCAA), Sarah Nielsen (CLASS), Sharon Radcliff (LIB), Balaraman Rajan (CBE), Julie Stein (EEP Manager), Nancy White (CEAS), Michele Korb (CAPR Chair)

Absent: Martin Castillo (Co-Curricular Programs), TBD (CSCI), TBD (GE), Sandy Luong (CBE)

1. Welcome and Announcements – Michele Korb, the new Chair of the Committee on Academic Planning and Review (CAPR) was introduced to the group. She will be replacing Jason Smith, the former chair.

2. Approval of Agenda – Approved. (M/S) Rajan/White.


   One minor adjustment was made to the minutes reflecting the correct spelling of Michele Korb’s name.

5. Overview/Refresher of Committee Responsibilities and the ILO Long-Term Assessment Plan
   - Stein provided an overview of the Intuitional Learning Outcomes (ILO) Subcommittee’s responsibilities and function referencing Google Slides entitled “ILO Subcommittee Overview Fall 2018”. Stein emphasized that the ILOs represent our university’s values and what we hope our students are able to collectively gain from our university during their time here and upon graduation. In other words, the core competencies we hope our students acquire during their time at CSUEB.
   - Stein reminded the subcommittee that there are 5 ILOs with several “sub” ILOs (i.e. “oral communication”, “written communication”, “information literacy”, etc.). There has been some consideration of “creativity” being a “sub” ILO under “thinking and reasoning”.
   - Stein reiterated the history of the ILO subcommittee, which began in 2006. The subcommittee has had significant faculty feedback over the years and has had cross-departmental/college champions.
   - Korb emphasized the importance of the relationship between CAPR and the ILO subcommittee – the ILO subcommittee can serve as guidance for CAPR as CAPR moves into developing guidelines on how to use data to write 5 year plans, where data is housed, etc.
   - Stein emphasized that this year’s plan for the ILO subcommittee was to discuss all the ILOs at some point of the year. Stein will send out the Call for Proposals for
faculty members to participate in upcoming projects. Stein was also seeking co-curricular participation, especially for ILOs such as teamwork, leadership, etc.

- Stein showed the subcommittee the new ILO website, which consists of resources, the Information Literacy Assignment Guide, a YouTube video on how to use the resources, and all the ILO rubrics.
- Stein showed the group the Long Term Assessment Plan, which consists of this body’s next steps and schedules up until 2026. Under this schedule, all rubrics will be developed by Spring 2019.

6. How we will communicate and collaborate (Team Drive)

- An ILO Subcommittee Google Team Drive was created. All members should have access to the Team Drive. Rajan said that all supplemental materials and minutes can be dropped into the Team Drive a few days before the next meeting.
- Korb discussed another communication task for the 2018-2019 academic year – communicating the relationship between CAPR and the ILO Subcommittee. Korb stated that it needs to be clearer why CAPR is involved in the work of this body. Stein stated that anything related to program review should be a part of CAPR since it is the center for program evaluation – this includes ILO Subcommittee work. Stein emphasized that the information from the ILO Subcommittee can greatly inform resource allocation. Korb mentioned that it should be explained to faculty members that assessment work like the ILO Subcommittee’s should be positioned as helping inform pedagogical practices not as trying to criticize the teacher. White agreed and said that her department has used information from the ILO Subcommittee to update their assignments.
- Nguyen inquired about membership composition, especially since new members will be a part of the communication and collaboration effort. Stein suggested the following members:
  o **College of Science**: Stein has solicited the help of Associate Dean Danika LeDuc to find a member from the College of Science. Stein will follow up with LeDuc in a few weeks after the haze of the first week of school has settled.
  o **GE**: Caron Inouye, General Education (GE) Director, had to step off this committee due to capacity concerns. Caron may receive support in her department in Spring 2019 and will suggest GE membership to this subcommittee at that time.
  o **Co-Curricular**: Suggestions include the AVP of Student Affairs, etc.
- Since the Oral Communication assessment is coming up and is very intensive, Stein and Rajan suggested that the body work at a capacity of “60% to 80%” review.

7. ILO Subcommittee Work for 2018-2019*

- Quantitative Reasoning: re-visit assessment recommendations and rubric
- Oral Communication: (assess video samples)
- Social Responsibility (assess)
- Pilot assess rubrics (sustainability, social justice)

* The following rubrics are planned to be developed in this academic year: sustainability, creativity, collaboration & teamwork, leadership, social justice
8. ILO Subcommittee additional member needs for assessment work during 2019-2020

- Rajan suggested that in the 2019-2020 academic year, there be 2 members from each college.
- Korb inquired whether non-tenure faculty members or adjunct faculty members can serve on this committee. Stein suggested that we can “fall back” on this plan. Additionally, Stein will suggest a new structure for this committee at a future meeting, which would also have to move through CAPR and the Senate.
- White inquired whether CAPR has to “approve” the ILO Subcommittee on a yearly basis before it can convene. Korb said “yes” because CAPR would like to make sure that committees are still productive for all participating members and the university community.

9. Draft Meeting schedule for Fall 2018

The following schedule was outlined:

a. August 27: Planning for Fall; Quantitative Reasoning assessment recommendations
b. September 10th: Quantitative Reasoning Rubric review; Oral Communication standard setting and start assessment
c. September 17th: ILO Oral Communication assessment
d. October 1st: ILO Oral Communication assessment
e. October 15th: Review Sustainability Rubric for approval to pilot in Spring 2019
f. November 5th: ILO Oral Communication assessment results
g. November 26th: Review Social Justice Rubric for approval to pilot in Spring 2019
h. December 3rd: Planning for Spring work

Stein asked the subcommittee if it was okay to formally put November 26th, the day after Thanksgiving Break, on our calendars. The subcommittee agreed that it would be fine to meet on that day.

10. Draft meeting schedule for Spring 2019

- Rajan suggested that for Spring 2019, we should consider other days such as Tuesdays since many holidays land on Mondays. Nielsen suggested that we revisit the schedule for Spring 2019 after September 19, when the teaching schedule will be finalized. For now, Stein and the Subcommittee will stick to the 1st and 3rd Mondays of each month and will figure it out after September 19.

11. Quantitative Reasoning assessment recommendations

- Stein asked for feedback about the Quantitative Reasoning (QR) assessment process and recommendations. Nielsen emphasized that disciplinary faculty members should be conducting the assessment for QR because of this group’s lack of comfort/competency, especially on standards such as “accuracy”.
• Rajan inquired if the decision for disciplinary faculty members conducting the QR assessment would have ripple affects on other disciplines. For example, would the other disciplines demand that they have disciplinary experts doing their assessment? Nielsen emphasized the need to compare our committee’s assessment results with the faculty member’s own results – there’s a disparity. Stein reiterated that QR is unique and stands out from the ILOs – even WASC agrees that it is a unique ILO that has its own set of challenges. Radcliff discussed how QR is not present in the humanities – on our campus, the College of Science, the College of Business, and the Social Sciences have QR, but not the humanities.

• Nguyen suggested that two new categories be added to the rubric for the *pilot stage* – “Not Applicable” (if the professor chooses not to assess in a specific standard) or “Can’t Assess” (if a committee member is not confident in assessing. Stein said she would look into whether this is possible, though there may be issues with Blackboard, norming, and the numerical weights of these new potential fields.

• The following recommendations were formally made:
  o Courses that align with QR next year can be targeted (i.e. ECON 300, ECON 499, etc.)
  o The subcommittee members agreed that the last slide of the Google Slides presentation entitled “QR ILO Rubric Development Project” is a good summary of suggestions in addition to the Google Doc that the faculty members put together about their recommendations. Rajan suggested that the latter document be filtered and shortened for the next meeting.

• Julia Olkin will come to the next meeting as well as Caron Inouye and Monika Sommerhalter to discuss the changes that were made to the QR rubric.

12. **Adjournment**

• The meeting was adjourned at 3:46 p.m.

Next meeting: Monday, September 10th, 2:00 PM – 3:50 PM. Since there will be assessment of the Oral Communication rubric, subcommittee members should meet in the computer Lab and bring their own headphones.