

## MEETING NOTES

### Information Literacy Learning Community (ILLC) 2016

October 13, 2016

10:10 to 11:00am (35-319b)

#### Membership

Academic Programs: Jack Phelan; Kennedy Library: Adriana Popescu, Katherine O'Clair, Kaila Bussert;  
Statistics: Beth Chance

~~~~~

| Agenda Item       | Action Items & Context                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | Responsible Parties                            | Due Date    |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Upper Division GE | Jack P. asks how the collaboration should work to prepare a list of appropriate courses. Katherine O. plans to meet Katie and take her expertise. Jack P. will speak with Katie T. in advance. Katherine O. will arrange a half hour talk with Katie T. | Jack Phelan, Katherine O'Claire, Kaila Bussert | October 11. |

## MEETING NOTES

1. Approve [meeting notes and action items](#)
2. Discussions:
  - Level of assessment
    - a. Lower division
    - b. Upper division GE
      - Katherine O'Claire spoke with Brenda Helmbracht and Brett Bodemer. Brett teaches History 319 which is a potential course to collect artifacts.
      - Jack Phelan: how many courses does Brett provide instruction? Katherine O.: there are four courses that Brett teaches. Two of them are Ethnic Studies 340 and History 319. Feedback from Brenda H. was that C3/C4 courses are writing intensive.
      - Katherine O. describes BRAE 340, it is a big class - 100 students. She also recommends Organic Agriculture and Horticulture classes. She suggests to look at this area, to find if any class can be pulled out for a signature assignment. She will talk with Katie tool to explore diversity of these classes. Answering a question from Jack P. about the diversity of students in BRAE 340 class - a lot of agriculture students take this course.
      - Beth Chance raises the challenge of finding representative sample of students. A concern that Upper level courses are discipline specific.
      - Katherine O: Brett B. is aware of courses which might be ideal candidates for signature assignments. Maggie has a detailed list of courses from which signature assignments can be pulled from in Winter. Katherine O. urges to identify courses that the committee might be interested in. She also proposes a model, where she sees ILLC partnering with faculty, where faculty will share artifacts and the ILLC share back to faculty the achievements of the rubric. She proposes to invite potential faculty from targeted areas in January. Katherine O. asks Beth C. regarding Maggie's course 316, how many sections should be included, from this course which has 60 students in 2

sections. Beth C. replies that, at least 5-6 sections and at least 10 artifacts from each section must be pulled.

- Jack P. refers to Mary Allen who advised 60 artifacts to be chosen from large classes as a random sample. Economics used this model for QR - which is a class of 245 students.
- Katherine O. informs the committee of the framework that she has developed with her colleagues and proposes to provide the rubric.
- Beth C. puts forth concerns regarding diversity of the classes, whether the students are taking some of the targeted upper level GE courses because they are easy? She cautions selecting a course for diversity for good reason instead of bad. Katherine O. says that the assignments cannot be changed. She shared her experiences about working with instructors. And she affirms her optimism on working with the instructors to get an ideal assignment crafted for the purpose.
- Jack P. requests Kaila and Katherine to share the list of the courses they have sorted. Katie Tool is knowledgeable about diversity of different majors, and can confirm which courses enroll with junior standing.
- Beth C. iterates the targeted areas are C4, D4 and F.
- Katherine O. says the next part is contacting instructors and asking for the course syllabus and outlines.
- Jack P. appreciates the procedure of a targeted and selected strategy and compares the way courses were selected in other core-competency committees which he refers to as 'casting the net'.
- Katherine O. cautions that the biggest challenge will be marketing. She suggests asking for help from College Librarians. She sees this as an opportunity for the faculty to improve the assignments.
- Beth C. asks, what are the focus of the targeted GE courses? Katherine O. replies that C is Arts and Humanities. D is Social Sciences. F is Technology, which is predominantly science and engineering cross-listed with other focus areas. BRAE is in that category.
- Jack P. asks how the collaboration should work to prepare a list of appropriate courses. Katherine O. plans to meet Katie and tap her expertise. Jack P. agrees and will speak to Katie T. in advance. Katherine O. plans to arrange a half an hour talk with Katie T.
- Methods and instruments
  - a. Signature assignments
  - b. Reflection components
    - Jack P. asks how the reflective component in the artifact should be evaluated, to see what measures the students have taken to answer or solve a problem or question in the assignment.
- Updates on working with the prior (ULO) assessment
  - Katherine O. reaffirms that revisiting the prior (ULO) assessment will be unnecessary utilization of time and resource.
  - Jack P. emphasizes that the most important aspect of connecting to the prior assessment is that the future report articulate what was done and why; as well as what we've learned from it. For example, we know it was successful in x,y,z areas...and \_\_\_\_\_ changes were made, that it was a modest effort but the assessment did indeed close the loop; discuss how the standards have since changed and describe how this assessment will be handled in different ways.
  - KOL - what we did: introducing peer to peer model of teaching. The assessment showed that library instruction improves skills; there was a dramatic increase in number of classes offered; hired a foundation-level experience librarian to focus on incorporating higher orders of learning into our general education

information literacy instruction program - going beyond the remembering level of blooms taxonomy to the higher levels; and used space instruction and what we'll be doing with it

○

3. Megan Oakleaf visit

- Assessment Series set for Thursday and Friday Jan 19, 20
  - Jack P. announces that the Assessment Series will be well marketed, and the session with Megan Oakleaf will be arranged at the ATL lab (Advanced Technologies Laboratory). He expects to have a full-attendance of 90 attendees for whom nine (9) 78-inch tables will be arranged.
- Morning and afternoon sessions with Megan Oakleaf on Thursday
  - Jack P. affirms Mary Pedersen's interest in this series and the focus of the ILLC will be in the first session where Megan Oakleaf will discuss critical learning.
  - Afternoon session is more about rubric design. Katherine O. asks if any discussion related to information literacy can be pictured? Kaila Bussert suggests that Lifelong learning might be an angle to look at.

4. Tasks for next meeting - 11/10

- Jack P. will contact Katie T. and inform her about the requirements of the ILLC and visit of Kaila B. and Katherine O. with her.
- Katherine O. and Kaila B. will bring the outcome of their meeting with Katie T.

~~~~~

**Fall 2016 Meeting Schedule**

~~Thursday 09/29 10:10am to 11:00am 35-319b – Fall Roadmap~~

~~Thursday 10/13 10:10am to 11:00am 35-319b – Level of Assessment, Assessment Instruments~~

Thursday 11/10 10:10am to 11:00am 35-319b – Rubric Planning & Design

Thursday 12/01 10:10am to 11:00am 35-319b – Research Questions and Hypothesis