ILO Subcommittee Meeting Notes
January 8, 2018 – 2:00 pm – 3:50 pm
SA 1400

ILO Subcommittee Members:
Present: Martin Castillo (Co-Curricular Program), Patrick Huang (CSCI), Caron Inouye (GE), Sandy Luong (CBE), Sarah Nielsen (CLASS), Sharon Radcliff (LIB), Balaraman Rajan (CBE), Julie Stein (Educational Effectiveness Project Manager)
Absent: Jen Nguyen (SCAA); Nancy White (CEAS), Jason Smith (CAPR Chair)

1. Welcome and Announcements Sarah motioned to begin, and Sandy Seconded

2. Volunteer secretary for January 8th ILO Subcommittee meeting: Sharon Radcliff

3. Approval of Agenda Sandy/Sarah/ vote all affirmative.

Discussion of adding a news item to meeting

4. Approval of minutes from November 20th, 2017; Sarah, Kevin seconded. Minutes approved (Rajan, Luong, and Castillo abstained).

5. Standard setting for ILO Information Literacy

Discussion of how appendices must be used in addition to the paper itself for: Scope; Gather, and Evaluate categories of the rubric. 10-11 student artifacts will need to be graded by each person. Must be done by Jan. 23rd. (In general: Tuesday after next meeting. Explanation of 4-3-2-1 scale - Fully & well done, mostly/adequately done, inadequately done, not done or ineffective. Pilot assessment; give any feedback on usefulness of rubric; e.g. criteria not making sense.

Kin 3750: paper (most popular rubric number applied in bold for each category)

Scope: 4s and 3s (People thought paper itself better indication than the short answer in appendix. Needed to use assignment instructions.)
Gather: 4s; 3s; (1) 2 (mostly 3s) Information in appendix not very extensive or detailed. Not much about search terms, etc…But the paper itself indicated good job gathering. One feedback: invite library liaison to learn search strategies. Needs to be with points or minimum criteria for the appendix questions.
Evaluate: 3s, 2s (mostly 2s); 3s thought paper supported a good range of sources; 2s thought appendix question showed lack of discrimination.
Analyze: 4s; 3s most were 3s. 2 (1); 3s thought not good connections. 4s thought power relations and background on issues good. 2s and 3s thought connections not well-developed.
Communicate: mostly 3s; 2s; mostly 3s. Seemed persuasive. But needed more disciplinary approach. Also more journal
Attribute: 4; 3 (s); mostly 3s; there are some inconsistencies, especially in in-text citing. Not
referred to all of them. Assessors would help if we had example of the type of format being used: also useful for students. But does show good use of attribution. Plagiarism hard to determine, but shift in style could be a clue. How can ethics be assessed; difficult to tell if it is really students writing.

6. Start Information Literacy assessment
   Everyone will go through each sample individually; then discuss. We are to finish at least half of the ones assigned through BB by the next meeting. Use notes field to make comments about how well the rubric and or assignment works.

7. Winter 2018 ILO schedule (1st and 3rd Mondays in January are holidays; changed to 2nd and 4th Monday in January)
   a. 1/8 Information Literacy standard setting and assessment
   b. 1/22 Information Literacy assessment
   c. 2/5 Review Information Literacy assessment results and review/edit rubric
   d. 2/19 Review and approve Social Responsibility Rubric/Sustainability rubric
   e. 3/5 Plan for spring quarter

Nguyen and White met with Nielsen on January 17th for standard setting.

Next meeting: Monday, February 05, 2018