Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO)
Subcommittee of CAPR

ILO Subcommittee Meeting Agenda
February 17th, 2:00 pm – 3:50 pm
Join Zoom Meeting
https://csueb.zoom.us/j/87506644869?pwd=1aPLTcqL4aw5NunOG6bfsuVwXovKPk.1
Meeting ID: 875 0664 4869
Passcode: 953825

ILO Subcommittee Members: Stephanie Alexander (LIB), Ana Almeida (CSCI), Ayona Chaterjee (CSCI) Ryan Heryford (CLASS), Balaraman Rajan (CBE), Stephanie Seitz (CBE), Julie Stein (APS), Nancy White (GE, CEAS)

Ana Almeida, Chair

1. Approval of agenda for February 17th
2. Review February 3rd minutes
3. Chair updates
    a. Update on 2/12 Launch meeting for academic assessment experiment using AI as a tool
    b. Closing the Loop for Written Communication Report CAPR presentation February 20th; Excom March 4th; Senate March 11th with Kevin Kaatz, Ana Almeida, Sarah Nielsen, and Mitch Watnik
    c. To further address campus AI policy for teaching and learning April 7th
4. ILO Information Literacy Assessment: (Julie, all)
    a. Day 2 Assessment Calibration Training, & Practice
    b. Assess Student work (link to be made accessible following calibration training when ILO Subcommittee is ready to assess)(Reference only as needed only, Day 1 Assessment Calibration Training and Practice)
    c. End of day feedback at 3:30
5. Remaining Spring 2025 ILO Subcommittee meeting dates via zoom: normally 1st and 3rd Mondays except for holidays and academic recess from 2:00 - 4:00 pm: 3/3, 3/17, 4/7, 4/21
6. Adjourn

Meeting summary with AI Companion

Quick recap

The meeting focused on assessing student information literacy skills, particularly their search strategies and source evaluation abilities. Participants discussed the assessment criteria, reviewed student work samples, and calibrated their expectations for student performance. They also addressed faculty engagement with AI tools, planned future meetings, and considered ways to improve data collection and assessment methods for information literacy skills.

Next steps

Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO)
Subcommittee of CAPR

- Julie to schedule a private norming session with Ayona before the next meeting.
- Julie to bring Ryan up to speed with the norming exercises already completed.
- All assessors to continue evaluating student artifacts, aiming for about 10 assessments each by the next session.
- Bala to prepare a more comprehensive inter-rater reliability report for the next session when more student artifacts have been assessed.
- All assessors to consider ways to improve data collection, such as having students track their search process in real-time.
- ILO Subcommittee to revisit discussions on AI policy at the end of the semester after completing the information literacy assessment.
- Julie to update the assessment platform to prevent accidental scoring on other reviewers' pages, if possible.
- ILO Subcommittee to consider revising the search criteria in light of emerging AI technologies and changing information literacy needs.
- Potential later follow up with GEOC regarding potential gaps in information literacy instruction in GE courses.

Summary

AI Access and Assessment Meeting Update

Ana discussed the plan to work with a minimum group to bring reports back to the Ilo and to Capr, focusing on using existing tools for assessment. She mentioned the possibility of getting access to Copilot Studio, but the process was ongoing. Stephanie Alexander asked about the timeline for getting access to Chat GPT Edu, to which Julie responded that it would likely be towards the end of the term. Ana also mentioned that the written communication report would be discussed and voted on in the next meeting on February 20th, and a Senate presentation would be held on March 11th. The group then moved on to discuss the information literacy assessment, with Julie leading the discussion and planning to refresh some concepts and calibrate student work samples.

Assessment Criteria for Search Strategies

Julie and Stephanie Alexander discussed the assessment criteria for students' search and evaluation strategies. They agreed that students should demonstrate appropriate search strategies based on their information needs, and that the context of their search matters. They also discussed the importance of evaluating sources for relevance and credibility. For a fully meets or mostly meets level, students should be tailoring their search strategies and showing thoughtfulness in their approach to finding information. They should also be evaluating sources for relevance and credibility, considering factors such as content, author expertise, and the source's credibility.

Enhancing Student Assignments and Assessments

In the meeting, Julie and Stephanie discussed the importance of reflection and critical thinking in student assignments. They emphasized the need for students to explain their choices and strategies, and to

evaluate sources based on their relevance and credibility. Julie also highlighted the goal of achieving consistency in assessing student work to increase the reliability of the assessment data. The team then practiced assessing a student's work, with each member providing their rating and comments. The discussion aimed to clarify the process and improve understanding of the assessment criteria.

Evaluating Student's Search Strategy and Literature Review

The team discussed the evaluation of a student's search strategy and literature review. They debated whether the student's approach, which involved a broad search and filtering, was appropriate or not. The team also discussed the assignment's requirements and how they influenced the student's search strategy. They considered whether the student's superficial search was acceptable given the assignment's nature. The team agreed to continue evaluating the student's work and to consider the context of the assignment in their evaluations.

KIN Assignment Instructions Reevaluation Discussion

In the meeting, Julie instructed the team to review the KIN assignment instructions, which were slightly modified from the previous ones. She asked them to read a student paper and provide their assessment and comments. The team then discussed their evaluations, with Stephanie Seitz initially giving the assignment a 4 but reconsidering it as potentially too narrow. Julie emphasized that their evaluations would likely be close, regardless of the score.

Improving Assessment Source Quality

The team discussed the quality of sources used in assessments, with Ana expressing surprise at the lack of recent references. She suggested that future assessments could benefit from data on the search process, including the sources ignored. Julie agreed and mentioned that they would be looking at this in the future. Stephanie Alexander praised the thoughtful approach to searching for information. The team then moved on to the assessment platform, with Julie explaining how to use it and the importance of being mindful of the page being assessed. She also mentioned that the rubric is embedded on the page for reference. The team was asked to make general comments during the session and to be careful not to accidentally assess someone else's work.

Assessing Management and Kinesiology Process

Julie discussed the process of assessing management and kinesiology, with participants including Stephanie, Ana, Nancy, and Paula. Initially, there were issues with accessing the student work, which Julie resolved by sharing the whole drive with the team. Participants were asked to assess and provide general comments on the process, content, and student learning. Julie also requested that the team

continue assessing until 3:35, after which she would drop a comments document into the chat for their feedback.

Assessing Student Work and Search Skills

In the meeting, the team discussed their observations and initial impressions of the student work they had assessed. They noted that the students' work often focused more on their evaluation of the sources rather than their search strategy. There was also a discussion about the potential gap in the students' ability to perform a literature search beyond simple Google searches. The team also discussed the possibility of collecting data differently to better assess the students' search and evaluation skills. They agreed to continue assessing more student work in future sessions to better understand the trends and potential issues. The team also discussed the importance of information literacy skills for students and how these skills might evolve in the future.