**ASCC Assessment Panel**

Approved Minutes

Thursday, January 24, 2013 9:00am -10:30am

110 Denney Hall

ATTENDEES: Breitenberger, Collier, Harvey, Krissek, Kuo, Hetherington, Hogle, Soundarajan

Agenda:

1. Approval of 1-10-13 Minutes
	* Krissek, Harvey, unanimously approved
2. Discuss Course Set 6 Reports
	* Committee members reviewed Music 251, Theatre 100, Biology 101 (Lima campus), Statistics 135 (Newark campus), Chemistry 121-122 (Columbus, Lima, and Newark campuses), and Psychology 367 (Lima campus)
	* The reports generally had positive features, including:
		+ Use of both indirect and direct measures
		+ Student surveys
		+ Embedded questions aligned with GEC outcomes; and in some cases, pre- and post-testing of students
		+ Rubrics aligned with GEC outcomes
	* Many of the reports could be improved in the following areas:
		+ How the assessment results (especially when the percentage of students reaching the stated criteria was too low) would be used for course or curriculum improvement was not clear
		+ All components of the course (e.g. laboratories in science courses) should be subject to GEC outcomes assessment
		+ In some cases, not all GEC outcomes were assessed, and it was not clear what the timeline would be for assessment of these learning outcomes
	* Feedback will be provided to the units keeping in mind that these reports were submitted a couple of years ago and assessment plans have likely been revised.
	* Next steps
		+ The remaining Course Set 6 reports will be reviewed at the next meeting.
		+ Need to determine the next course set because reports need to be requested from units soon.
			- The original idea was that the units would provide a brief update every 5 years and provide a full report every 10 years.
			- Should make units aware that there is an expectation for follow up. Waiting 5 years for an update seems too long and should maybe be one to two years.
		+ Ask reports to include how they will close the assessment loop by providing information on what they did with the data that was collected. Maybe we are not giving units enough time from the time we ask for reports and when the reports are actually due to provide this information.
		+ Alan Kalish previously provided consultants to assist instructors with improving learning specifically related the general education expected learning outcomes. This could be beneficial to closing the assessment loop. Caroline will talk to Alan to see if he has ideas for improving this last step of the assessment process.
		+ Carmen Assessment tool
			- It is a lot of work and a lot to maintain through updates. We have to make sure it’s something we really need and will be going to use in the future.
			- The data is removed after a short period of time.
			- The idea was for students to take a survey in Carmen that is separate from the SEI. Instructors could also take a survey in Carmen. These surveys are intended to be simple.
			- The questions would come from the expected learning outcomes.
			- This would allow us to review all GE categories.
			- Have to consider where the results would get accumulated. That information may need to be sent to the curriculum office.
			- Need to discuss with Valarie Rake about what is difficult with this tool and why it is difficult.
			- Biology has questions regarding GE on Carmen but it is done manually for each course. The tool they use is called SALG (Student Assessment of their Learning Gains, http://www.salgsite.org/)
		+ Going forward we must determine if we want to continue with course reports like those collected in the previous sets or if there is a desire to move towards required rubrics for each category which may make assessment easier for instructors.