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

Absent: Michele Korb (CAPR Chair)

1. Approval of Agenda – (M/S) Doolan/White.

2. Minutes from September 11, 2018 – Approved with adjustments (adding a “y” at the end of “exemplar”). (M/S) Doolan/Nielsen.

3. ILO Oral Communication Standard Setting #2
   - For “Purpose”, there was discussion about how the speaker very clearly stated his purpose, but veered away from his purpose during the presentation. Castillo commented that assessment might get easier when back-to-back assessments are conducted so that there are standards of comparison.
   - For “Language”, Stein noted that “Delivery” could often obfuscate and overshadow language, so the two criteria may go hand-in-hand.
   - For “Delivery”, Luong commented that a lower score could result when delivery gets in the way of content.
   - For “Evidence”, there was much discussion about source credibility and accuracy. Stein emphasized that instructors must have clear directions about how students should approach evidence – should they cite, should they add words to complement pictures, etc. Rajan added that pictures on their own might not be effective evidence if the pictures do not correspond to what is being stated in the presentation. Castillo stated that because we are not disciplinary experts, it is challenging for us to assess whether a picture is what it is purported to be – is it a legitimate picture from a credible source? After listening to the discussion about accuracy and credibility, Rajan proposed going back to the committee of participating faculty members (which includes Korb) to talk about whether “credibility” and “accuracy” should be added to the “Evidence” criterion.
   - Item #2 was used in standard setting. The results for Item #2 was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Aids</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. ILO Oral Communication Assessment of Student Work

- The subcommittee began assessing student work using the ILO Oral Communication Rubric. The following questions and concerns came up during the process:
  - Stein reminded the subcommittee that “Presentation Aids” and “Audience Engagement” may not be applicable to all assignments. When an assignment does not have “Presidents Aids” or “Audience Engagement”, the subcommittee should use the “N/A” column (which currently says “Not Assessed”).
  - Rajan clarified the difference between the “N/A” column and the “Can’t Assess” (C/A) column. “C/A”, which is currently weighted at 9 points, is when the assessor cannot, due to their own knowledge, make a proper assessment. “N/A”, which is currently weighted at 0 points, means that an assessment cannot transpire due to the rubric or assignment.
  - Rajan and Stein noted that some assignments have not given proper sharing settings. As a result, the files cannot be opened. In these situations, no assessment should occur. The file name should be written down and sent to Stein.
  - Luong inquired about group assignments – how do we assess delivery of several group members since it will vary from member to member? The group decided that an “average” of all group members should be taken.
- Rajan stated that subcommittee members should finish 50% of the assessments by the next ILO Subcommittee meeting.

5. Adjournment

- The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p.m. (M/S) Castillo/Luong.

Next meeting: Monday, October 1st, 2:00 PM – 3:50 PM. Since there will be continued assessment of assignments using the Oral Communication rubric, subcommittee members should meet in the computer Lab and bring their own headphones.