

# Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO) Subcommittee of CAPR

## ILO Subcommittee Minutes

November 2, 2020, 2:00 pm – 3:50 pm

<https://csueb.zoom.us/j/81208497727?pwd=a0lqY1lMd0QxeGkyL09tQlQ3NHlNQ09>

Meeting ID: 812 0849 7727

Passcode: 569805

**ILO Subcommittee Members:** Martin Castillo (co-curricular program), Daniel Doolan (CSCI), Stephanie Alexander (LIB), Balaraman Rajan (CBE, co-chair), Julie Stein (APS), Nancy White (CEAS), Ana Almeida (CSCI), Jennifer Luna (co-curricular program), My-Lan Huynh (co-curricular program), Thirumalai Thattai Selvarajan (CBE), Danvy Le (CLASS)

Absent: Arnab Mukherjea

**Co-chairs:** Daniel Doolan (CSCI) and Balaraman Rajan (CBE)

1. Approval of November 2nd agenda
  - a. Ana moved to approve, Bala seconded; passed unanimously
2. Approval of [October 19th meeting minutes](#)
  - a. Revision: Martin was absent
  - b. Ana moved to approve, Nancy seconded; passed with one abstention
3. [Collaboration Leadership and Teamwork Rubric](#) (Nancy White)
  - a. Nancy suggests that we take some additional time and review this again in the spring. Daniel asked Julie and Bala to discuss if we're facing external pressures to deliver this rubric sooner. Nancy, Bala and Gretchen (one of the leads on the rubric) could do some advance editing work before bringing it back to the committee. There is a team getting together to create an assignment guide for this rubric in the spring (led by Gretchen). So revisiting this rubric in the ILO subcommittee in the early spring would be good, as this will be assessed in 2022-2023.
  - b. Nancy moves that we take this up early in the spring for additional refinement, and a subgroup be tasked with coming up with specific rubric improvement recommendations for the group. Ana seconded the motion. Passed unanimously.
4. Assess Creative Thinking and Expression student work
  - a. Review Creative Thinking and Expression [draft rubric](#)
    - i. Daniel set the group off to evaluate on our own, with an agreement to check in for a discussion at 3:30.
  - b. 1) Open Blackboard 2) Click on "Evaluation Session Started" link from 10/5 email from Cheryl Saelee
  - c. Assess student work
  - d. Add notes to the [Creative Thinking and Expression Assessor](#) document
  - e. Discussion:
    - i. Bala - I added comments to the document, but why is scope and audience on the rubric? Not sure why it is included. My-Lan - some of the examples gave good examples of the scope (like the Shakespeare project), but it really boils down to the assignment prompt, and how well the assignment coaches students to provide the scope. Bala - is the scope important for creating thinking? Daniel - Agree with that concern, it isn't hard to imagine where the creative project has the audience and scope is laid out in advance; does it have to be discerned by the creator, or can it be pre-assigned by the project instructions and that is fine? It seems unnecessary in

## **Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO) Subcommittee of CAPR**

that way. Julie - it could be hard to assess if you're not the instructor. Danvy - so many of the students are doing it, but they aren't articulating it, which makes it hard to evaluate (the assessor can see it is interdisciplinary, but does the student?). For this rubric - are we evaluating what they wrote or the actual project they did (drawing, poem, etc). Martin - the audience part of the scope helps, but I'm not sure that it is necessary for every assignment. Bala - the scope helps me evaluate the assignment, but still not sure why it is important for creative thinking. Martin - having the scope helps determine the goal of the project. My-Lan - the scope helps the student understand the bigger picture of what they're doing with their project.

- ii. How did the assessment go? Rajan - the training/practice artifacts helped a lot with the actual assessment. Julie - I don't see myself qualified to assess this. When the students answer the question, it is easier, but some of the elements seem very disciplinary (like degree), so I don't feel qualified to assess them. Rajan - when they don't answer the questions/address the assignment prompt, or if the assignment doesn't address parts of the rubric, then it shows up in the rubric scoring/assessment of the student. Danvy - the best assignments have the instructions that help the students; it feels like we're evaluating the assignment prompts, not necessarily the student work. Daniel - the industry specific expertise makes this one more challenging. Martin - for some, it felt like I wasn't necessarily qualified to do the evaluation. Julie - it can be hard to know if they're hitting the mark unless the reflection is perfect. Jennifer - if the student is rushing through, and the reflection isn't in depth, it can make it difficult to assess, because it can make it seem like a miss even when it may not be.
- iii. Risk taking - Rajan - it was difficult to assess the risk taking or controversial topic, some of the assignment topics lend themselves better to risks/controversies versus assignments like the marketing assignment where they're comparing two businesses. Danvy - when we practiced assessment, we didn't really talk about risk-taking. Are they pushing themselves out of their comfort zone, or are they looking at controversial things? And why is controversy creative? My-Lan - so pushing beyond your own skill set (using pencil versus charcoal) could qualify. Daniel - the assignment is key to prompting quality student reflections.

5. Remainder Fall 2020 meeting schedule

- a. November 16th: Assess creative thinking and expression student work

6. Proposed Spring ILO Subcommittee meeting dates will be discussed again on 11/16 : 1/25, 2/1, 2/15, 3/1, 3/15, 4/5, 4/19, 5/3

7. Adjourn

- a. Bala motioned, Rajan seconds, passed unanimously.