ASCC Assessment Panel

Approved Minutes

Monday, November 17, 2014 12:00pm-1:30pm

110 Denney Hall

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

1. Approval of 11-3-14 Minutes
   * Krissek, Wolf, unanimously approved
2. Review assessment evaluation rubric
   * Will provide simplified summaries of the assessment reports that have been reviewed
   * When rubrics are developed for reporting course set assessment data, add rubric levels on the evaluation rubric for reviewers.
   * Executive summary of the GE for accreditation
     + What is the GE model
     + How the GE is being assessed
     + Are students achieving the learning outcomes? If not, what changes are being made? If yes, how are they going to continue to improve?
3. Discuss remaining Course Set S1 reports
   * WGSST 1110
     + Reported on just one section
     + The direct assessment method used was a writing assignment in which they developed a rubric to evaluate the assignment.
     + Just reported the grade on the assignment. Did not break down the rubric into addressing each GE learning outcome and did not provide prompt for the writing assignment.
       - The evaluation rubric has basic elements like content and organization.
       - It is not clear that the grade received necessarily indicates that students have achieved the expected learning outcomes.
     + GE expected learning outcomes are not in the syllabus.
     + Feedback letter to send: Low
       - Need to know what the prompt is for the writing assignment
       - State how the prompt aligns with the Cultures & Ideas ELOs
       - Specify how the student written work achieves the ELOs
       - Address whether or not this is a representative sample. If there are online versions of this course it would be beneficial to assess those sections as well.
       - Provide resources along with contacts (Alan Kalish and/or Steve Fink)
       - Those reports that receive a low feedback letter should be informed of the assessment conference in Spring 2015 as a resource.
     + Meet with department
       - Explain what the Assessment Panel is interested in.
       - Provide example of a good report (Comparative Studies CS S1 report or LARCH 2367)
       - Request resubmission
   * EALL 1231
     + Holistic approach
     + Embedded test questions were used as direct assessment method
     + Did not specify which embedded questions align with each ELO and did not report on how changes are being made specifically to improve student learning in regard to the GE ELO’s.
     + Provides several areas of improvement for course
     + Feedback letter to send: Middle
   * Theatre 2811
     + Several methods were used to look at student responses and within each assignment there was some way to align to ELO’s
     + Rubric was used to grade assignment with specific categories for the GE ELO’s
     + A quiz evaluated one ELO and reported one score.
     + Indirect method: student survey
     + 96% of students achieved ELO 1 and 90% of students achieved ELO 2
     + Uniformity among course sections
     + It would be beneficial to know how many total students were enrolled
     + Feedback letter to send: High (good to share as example)
   * Music 2252
     + Department used their own ELOs instead of the two GE learning outcomes
     + Used specific questions on exams for direct assessment
     + Indirect assessment was an exit survey
     + Did not include sections taught at the Marion campus
     + Closing the loop: need to develop consistent embedded questions that are included in all sections of the course, regardless of campus.
     + Feedback letter to send: Medium
       - Can’t say that students have achieved the GE elos.
       - They can use their current assessment plan but they need to map it to the GE ELOs.
   * Chemistry 1100
     + Department created the online component of the course and dropped the credit hours from 5 to 3
     + Satisfies the GE Physical Science category which has 4 ELOs
     + Syllabus
       - Nothing stated about how the GE ELOs are met. No academic misconduct statement and no standard disability statement are on the syllabus.
     + Embedded exam questions (multiple choice) were used for direct assessment and mapped questions to the GE ELOs. Several questions per ELO per exam were used.
     + Level of achievement expected was 50%. Panel thought the bar could be set higher.
     + Data was provided for online and for in-class offerings.
     + There did not appear to be a trend between in-class and online sections. The same questions were asked.
     + The report provided the exam questions mapped to the actual ELOs.
     + No information about the data being shared or steps moving forward was provided.
     + Feedback letter to send: Medium (need to “close the loop”)
   * Rubrics and Reporting
     + Develop draft rubric of Cultures & Ideas and have WGSST and Philosophy provide input.
     + Include the total number of students enrolled in the course and the number of sections in the Assessment Panel Report to ASCC. (e.g. 130 students in 9 sections)
     + Consider editing the report requirements to include the rubric scores of 1-4 once rubrics are developed.
4. Review Individuals & Groups Rubric
   * Very good. It is clear that the department put a lot of thought and effort into this rubric.
   * Request that department move forward with the GE departmental assessment report using this rubric.
5. Review History departmental report
   * Rubric is very simple
   * Very few students scored at a level one on the rubric
   * Stated that many History courses do not address contemporary issues as part of ELO 2.
   * The department has a broad range of courses that fulfill the GE Historical Study category but assessed and reported on just 2000 and 3000 level courses.
   * It would be useful to get some sense of the proportion of the students that are taking the course to count towards the major.
   * One concern that was raised by the department is that the rubric overlaps with ordinary grading.
   * Assessment going forward (to discuss in a meeting with department and Assessment Panel Chairs)
     + Expect a report every 3 years
     + Would like the titles of the courses included
     + Include 1000 level courses
     + Future reports should also include assessment of the GE diversity categories that the courses fulfill