

## **Institutional learning Outcomes (ILO) SubCommittee of CAPR**

**Nov 15, 2-3.50 pm**

### **In attendance:**

ILO Subcommittee Members: Stephanie Alexander (LIB), Martin Castillo (co-curricular program), Moayed Daneshyari (CSCI), Kevin Kaatz (CLASS), Nidhi Khosla (CSCI), Balaraman Rajan (CBE), Julie Stein (APS), Nancy White (CEAS).

**Absent:** Yung-I Liu (CAPR Chair), Rajan Selvarajan (CBE)

1. Volunteer for minutes - Khosla
2. Approval of November 1st agenda (??)
3. Approval of Nov 1 minutes (M//Castillo, S/ White).
4. Discussion of rubric
  - a. S Alexander resumed discussion of Information Literacy rubric from last meeting. It was reminded that the focus was on assessment of only two criteria/categories: "Gather" and "Evaluate". ILO Subcommittee members discussed the lack of discussion in the samples about the process used to gather and evaluate information.
  - b. Scope of "evaluate" criterion was discussed. For example, should 'evaluate' also cover the method and content of the research the student had found and how would this be done for fields ILO SubCommittee members are unfamiliar with.
  - c. It was discussed that the two criteria sound a lot like they belong with critical thinking and what the scope of "evaluate" is.
  - d. Discussion on the challenges of designing appropriate assignments and rubrics. Volunteering faculty for this cycle may have felt that they ask their student to do this work anyway. However, the outcomes did not come through the samples. It seems a repeat of what happened in 2018.
  - e. Discussion on how ILO subcomm members assess "gather" and "evaluate" in their own work.
  - f. Castillo re-emphasised the need to rephrase the 1 (lowest level) to reflect no discussion at all of how the "gather" was done.
5. Continue ILO Information Literacy Targeted Assessment: The group reconvened at 3:00 p.m.

6. Alexander led the discussion. Stein noted that everyone had completed the assessment. The Sociology and Biology papers were perhaps better than the others with respect to the use of the rubric. The asking of the right prompt/right questions to get at what needs to be assessed was emphasized. White and Khosla shared that in one's own classes, the "gather" process may not be known to us as we see mostly the end product.
7. Rajan and Stein emphasized the need to note our thoughts on the rubric and the assignments assessed into the shared document.
8. Members shared appreciation for the collective work and the support of each other when working on the assessments.
9. Adjourn 3:50 p.m. (M/White, S/Alexander)