ASCC Assessment Panel

Approved Minutes

Monday, November 3, 2014 12:00pm-1:30pm

110 Denney Hall

ATTENDEES: Breitenberger, Collier, Hogle, Jenkins, Krissek, Lin, Nini, Wolf

Agenda:

1. Approval of 10-20-14 minutes
	* Breitenberger, Nini, unanimously approved
2. Finalize Course Set S2 reports to request
	* Consistent with the approach that was used for CS S1
	* Requesting 30 course reports from 3 categories (Historical Study, Writing & Communication Level 2, and Literature)
	* Includes ASC & non-ASC courses
	* Foreign Language course requests will be postponed
3. Review Course Set S1 reports and distribute the remaining reports
	* Philosophy 1100, 1300, & 1332
		+ Student grades are used for reporting GE assessment
		+ Some of the syllabi do not have explanations as to how they meet the GE elo’s, some courses do not have the elo’s on the syllabus, and some syllabi have old GEC language.
		+ Doesn’t seem like the instructors were involved.
		+ Doesn’t seem as though there was much attempt to align grades to elo’s.
		+ What needs to be communicated:
			- Share with the ASC Curriculum Committee
			- Provide the department with support that they need so they understand what is required.
			- When resubmitting a report they will likely need time to collect data.
			- Resubmission will be due at the end of Spring semester.
			- Talk to Steve Fink, report to ASCC during panel report, and have follow up meeting with department.
				* Provide the department with a sample report, explanation of what is expected, new deadline, and resources.
	* LARCH 2367
		+ 3 writing assignments were used to assess GE cultures & ideas and a rubric was used for each assignment.
			- 100% of the students sampled reached the expected level of accomplishment for both elo’s.
		+ A voluntary student survey was given at the end of the course
			- 67% of the class agreed that they felt “better prepared to analyze major forms of American thought and culture as they find expression in the American Landscape.”
			- 73.3% of students agree or strongly agree that they “better understand the patterns of belief and perception which have guided Americans in shaping the American Landscape since colonization.”
			- The instructor and GTAs suggest that the reason for this gap between what the students learn and what they think they should have learned can be attributed to students initially believing that the class would be about American Landscap*ing* rather than American Landscape. The instructor will be clearer and repeat references to the definition of “landscape” throughout the course.
		+ Collected data for second writing but did not include in the report.
		+ Data collected seemed to be done appropriately and with conscious effort.
		+ The instructor provided ways in which to “close the loop” of assessment in order to improve student learning.
		+ Feedback letter to send: High
	* LING 2000 and 2000H
		+ 3 sections of LING 2000 and 2 sections of 2000H
		+ Developed embedded questions aligned with the elo’s.
		+ Discovered there was an error with one of the questions developed.
		+ The Honors sections performed lower on question four than the non-honors sections. This was discussed by the unit and they will continue to refine assessment methods and present findings at the next annual faculty meeting.
		+ The assessment approach was reasonable but would like to see the department address how they will improve student learning where scores weren’t as high.
		+ Feedback letter to send: High
	* Art Ed 1600
		+ Assessed student performance more than GE learning outcomes
		+ Grading rubrics were used with some reference to GE elo’s but also included the evaluation of student writing skills not related to the GE outcomes.
		+ They may need help linking student data directly to the GE.
		+ Evaluated both online and in-class courses.
		+ Can’t seem to separate the GE assessment from student grades.
		+ It’s clear that they want to improve the online course but doesn’t address the GE elo’s.
		+ Feedback letter to send: Middle
	* History of Art 2001, 2002, 2901, 3901
		+ Looking at elo’s specifically through grades.
		+ Not a lot of numbers provided other than grades
		+ Department believes that they are achieving the GE elo’s but not providing numbers to show how each elo is being fulfilled.
		+ No direct action is being taken.
		+ The approach is reasonable but they haven’t quite understood how to evaluate GE elo’s specifically.
		+ Feedback letter to send: Middle
	* THEATRE 2100
		+ Evaluated the GE elo’s using questions embedded in the midterm and final exam as well as samples from student response papers.
		+ Indirect methods of student surveys were also used.
		+ First elo used embedded questions in exams. The questions were provided along with the percentage of students who answered correctly.
		+ The second elo was evaluated by student response papers. Rubrics for evaluation were provided but student achievement was not presented in the report.
		+ The only thing missing from the report was the second elo statistics.
		+ Feedback letter to send: Middle
	* Comparative Studies 2367.08, 2341, and 2370
		+ Pre & post short essay questions were used as well as some embedded questions on exams targeted specifically to the GE elo’s and student self-assessment.
		+ Good example of writing assignment to evaluate the GE elo’s.
		+ Provided a brief description of actions taken which was, in large part, creating better assessment tools.
		+ 2367.08 reported on second level writing
		+ Reported on each elo separately even when one question or assignment addressed more than one GE elo.
		+ Feedback letter to send: High
			- How are you using the results to improve student learning? This should be included in all feedback letters.
	* Data needs to be provided specific to each individual GE elo. Data should not be based on assignment grades or lumping all of the elo’s together.