ASCC Assessment Panel

Unapproved Minutes

Friday, October 2, 2015 12:30pm-2:00pm

110 Denney Hall

ATTENDEES: Collier, Hawkins, Hogle, Jenkins, Krissek, Lin, Nini, Vaessin, West

Agenda:

1. Approval of 9-18-15 minutes
   * Krissek, Lin, unanimously approved
2. Review GE Historical Study assessment reports
   * AAAS 1121 and 1122 reviewed by Larry Krissek & Jialin Lin
     + One section of each course was assessed on the main campus and one section of AAAS 1122 was assessed at the Mansfield campus.
     + Only one expected learning outcome was assessed per section and each section assessed a different elo.
       - The report discusses major assessment which could explain why they only assessed one expected learning outcome. Major assessment reporting only requires one expected learning outcome to be assessed per year.
     + The direct measure used was a final essay question.
       - The expected level of achievement was not provided.
       - The description of how the work was graded included components that are not part of the GE expected learning outcomes.
     + To address how the data is being used they are going to talk to the faculty and consider changing the assessment method to a take-home essay question instead of an in-class assignment on the last day of the semester.
     + The syllabi are missing the academic misconduct & disability services boilerplate language.
     + Require a meeting with Assessment Panel members to discuss resubmitting a GE assessment report.
       - Could suggest a consultation with UCAT focusing on GE assessment.
   * History departmental report reviewed by Julia Hawkins & Harald Vaessin
     + 10% of courses were assessed and evaluated by faculty.
       - Would have been beneficial to provide the specific direct assessment measures that were used for each course.
     + Found a slight difference between 2000 & 3000 level courses.
     + Regional campuses were included.
     + Closing the loop was not addressed in the report.
     + Report states that many history courses do not aim to achieve the second GE expected learning outcome of the Historical Study category: “Students describe and analyze the origins and nature of contemporary issues.”
       - The GE Historical Study expected learning outcomes were developed by the History department.
     + Feedback to send: medium level
       - Provide detail on how the data is being used to improve student learning of the GE expected learning outcomes.
       - Provide a clearer idea of the type of work being collected to complete GE assessment.
   * International Studies 3350 reviewed by Julia Hawkins and Harald Vaessin
     + A very detailed report using lots of assessment methods and included writing samples.
     + They have a plan in place to discuss using the data to make improvements but changes to be made are not presented in the report.
     + Data is not presented by each individual expected learning outcome. It’s evident that GE assessment was done correctly but just needs to be reported by each expected learning outcome.
     + The expectation for student achievement was not provided.
     + Request an appendix to the report to separate out the data by each expected learning outcome. This will be beneficial to the unit and their students by being able to use the data to improve student learning by each expected learning outcome.
   * Engineering 2361 reviewed by Paul Nini and Patricia West
     + Very good report
     + Could be more specific on the closing the loop section.
     + Used 2 direct measures. One of the direct measures was a team project.
     + Feedback to send: high level
   * Economics report reviewed by Paul Nini and Patricia West
     + Needs to provide more detail on how the data is being used to improve student learning of the GE expected learning outcomes.
     + Would be beneficial to provide more details about the assignments.
     + Should provide the expected level of student achievement for the GE expected learning outcomes.