**ASCC GE Assessment Panel**

Approved Minutes

Monday, May 14, 2012 10:00 -11:30 AM

110 Denney Hall

ATTENDEES: Collier, Hetherington, Highley, Hogle, Jenkins, Masters, Sanders, Soundarajan, Vankeerbergen

Agenda:

1. Approval of 4-30-12 minutes
	* Sanders, Masters, unanimously approved
2. Update from Mitch Masters regarding ASCC discussion of the revised GE language
	* Each panel is going to review the language at their meetings. Concern was expressed regarding an expected learning outcome that was removed from the Natural Science category. “Students learn key events in the history of science” was removed because courses were not addressing this expected learning outcome. It was suggested by Alan Beyerchen that the expected learning outcome could be added by changing the language to reflect historical conceptual ideas of science rather than key events. No other areas seem problematic. All panels will report back to the assessment panel chair after reviewing the GE language.
	* The revised GE language does not have to be reviewed by the ASC Senate because changes are not being made. At the moment we are simply making explicit what we have now so that those submitting proposals have guidelines. In a couple of years changes can be made if necessary.
3. Revisions to Education Abroad and Service Learning GE submission guidelines
	* There can be various ways of doing assessment but it should be strongly recommended that faculty use a reflection paper or essay.
		+ Other assessment methods can be used as long as they are able to be evaluated by the common rubric. This should be stated in the submission guidelines.
		+ Faculty could use multiple assignments for assessment. It would be simple to have one assignment that addresses all three learning outcomes but they could have multiple assignments to address each outcome individually.
	* The Appendix should provide examples and Chris Highley can provide a prompt sample that he would use for his education abroad course to show discipline specific examples as ideas for proposers.
	* 3b) State that additional direct and indirect assessments are encouraged
	* These guidelines do not need to go to ASCC
		+ The guidelines will be edited based on panel discussion and emailed to assessment panel members for approval
4. Developing a grading rubric
	* Alexis Collier provided a rough draft of an Education Abroad rubric based on the AACU Value Rubrics
		+ Rubrics use a 4 or 5 point scale
			- Use numbers because you don’t want letter grades
			- A score of 0 can be used.
		+ We have 3 expected learning outcomes for Education Abroad
			- It has to be determined what you mean by “knowledge,” “effective functioning,” and “enrichment”
		+ Chris Highley and Alexis Collier have a meeting this afternoon to develop an Education Abroad rubric with OIA
	* Panel discussion on the rough draft of Education Abroad rubric
		+ Expected Learning Outcome 1 (Knowledge of host country and US)
			- Some requirements to achieve a 4 seem unrealistic for an introductory course and for those students who have not declared a major. Some faculty may feel like they failed if they cannot reach the highest level.
				* For GE courses we expect a score of 2-3 but as students advance in their degrees/majors they should be able to achieve a 4. Should leave 4 levels on rubric but make it clear that 3 levels are adequate for GE courses.
			- Level 1: “minimal awareness” rather than “recognize”
		+ Expected Learning Outcome 2 (Skills for effective functioning)
			- Verbal and nonverbal communication is important. Students should be able to interact with people in their host country.
			- Should have the instructor do at least some of the evaluation. Have to prompt students to think beyond what happens by pushing them to think about how it is an achievement to effectively communicate or travel in the host country.
			- If students keep a journal then they will be able to remember moments better after the experience
				* They could turn in selected journal entries for assessment
			- Level 1: “Able to navigate at the basic level”
			- Level 3: “Reaches out independently”
		+ Expected Learning Outcome 3 (Enrichment to Academic Experience)
			- How has it enriched their academic experience in terms of a) knowledge b) skills and c) Attitudes. (add these 3 sections to rubric)
	* Each Expected Learning Outcome will have just one row to keep it simple and make it easier to apply to a wide variety of courses.
	* Need Service Learning involvement to create rubric for Service Learning category
		+ Share the GE submission guidelines with Ola Ahlqvist (Service Learning Director) and ask him for a recommendation for someone to assist with developing a rubric
		+ Need a meeting to work on Service Learning Rubric to make clear what it is that we want students to know and be able to do in a language that everyone can understand.
5. Carmen tool for student and faculty GE course assessment
	* Since the Pilot cannot begin until Spring 2013 there is time to create a way for instructors to use Carmen to answer questions regarding assessment which would be similar to the questions students would answer.