ILO Committee Meeting

October 28, 2020

3:00PM

Zoom

Present: D. Coates, B. deDie, P. Eagan, G. Fredericks, P. Henning, P. Malsom, D. Mondoux, A. Moore, C. Oliphant, M. Roty, T. Stefanick, L. Wells

1. Did all have an opportunity to take a look at the attachment that was sent out via email yesterday? This document was crafted by B. deDie.
   a. Do we want to give faculty an opportunity to hit pause and do a 5-year cycle AND/OR give an opportunity to do a do-over, where the four-year cycle would start over?
      i. Does this have to be consistent? Example: can departments choose which one they prefer to do since both will be ending in the same year?
         1. If departments choose to re-access, then there should be a reason and they should be held accountable for why.
      ii. Options to choose from - Everyone can start over from year one, everyone takes a pause, or everyone can take a pick of the two.
         1. Should this be taken to ALC for their feedback and recommendations, or should the committee make a recommendation to ALC? This committee should be the one to make the recommendation to ALC.
         2. Could we just say that the first year is two years so then it would roll all three options into one option?
      iii. Selected option - Year one is now two years long – they can start from scratch or they can start doing data collection.
   b. Do you see any problem with departments seeing what other departments are doing? This would be via a shared Canvas site.

2. Old assessment document was meant to be used over the course of four years. The old document became cumbersome. B. deDie created a new document that can now be used for assessment.
   a. The timeline would be expanded to 2019-2024 from 2019-2023.
   b. Chairs have a stipend attached to assessment, so there needs to be adequate work associated with the tasks needed to be done by chairs.
   c. All of the outcomes on the master syllabi be nested within an ILO, student learning outcomes, other course outcomes, alternate course strategy.
   d. Right now, we are only assessing outcomes at the course level, eventually will get up to the program level.

      e. Are we okay using the title "Other Course Outcomes"? Yes, this was okay with the committee.

3. Should there be hot links or pop outs added to the form to make it more user friendly? In the blanks on the form, there will probably be prompts added to help make it more clear.
   a. Have not been able to recreate the Blinn tool and have not used it for this round.
      i. Everyone is going to use year one. Year two gives more detail.

4. Would like to reconvene after winter break to look at year three and year four.
   a. Will be hearing from D. Coates individually to find out who each person will be mentoring.

5. This tool will be presented to ALC during the December meeting. This will give the smaller committee time to finish completing the form to present. However, the proposal to make year one two years long will be presented to ALC during the November meeting.

6. Are there any objections with this tool going forward? No.