ASCC Assessment Panel

Unapproved Minutes

Friday, October 23, 2015 12:30pm-2:00pm

110 Denney Hall

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

1. Approval of 10-2-15 Minutes
   * Lin, Krissek, unanimously approved
2. Reports
   * Comparative Studies 1100 reviewed by Larry Krissek and Jialin Lin.
     + Included all GE categories.
     + Not clear if they included regional campuses.
     + No mention of online offerings.
     + Direct assessment method used was a pre and post exam.
     + Indirect assessment method used was an end of course survey.
     + Did not state the criteria for meeting the expected learning outcomes but showed significant improvement from the pre to post test.
     + Using the results to create a guide for future instructors.
     + Medium to High level feedback
       - Could be improved by providing additional information on how the assessment process will be used to improve student learning of the expected learning outcomes.
   * English 2201, 2290, and 2261 reviewed by Larry Krissek and Jialin Lin.
     + Direct assessment method used was a pre and post test.
       - A team of graders assessed the tests rather than each instructor.
     + Did not provide clear criteria for satisfying the expected learning outcomes.
     + Fifteen percent or fewer students were in the lowest category.
     + Did not specify how much regional data was included.
     + The syllabi did not use the standard academic misconduct and disability statements.
     + In the report they state that the next steps will depend on which courses they are asked to assess again and will work on GE assessment when requested to do so.
       - GE assessment should be happening on an ongoing basis for all GE courses whether or not they are requested to submit a report. Need to make this clear in the feedback.
     + Medium level feedback
       - Need to separate the data by each GE expected learning outcome.
   * EDUTL 2368 and 3356 reviewed by Larry Krissek and Jialin Lin.
     + Regional campuses and online offerings were included.
     + Each instructor determined the direct assessment method to use.
     + Didn’t state the criteria for meeting the expected learning outcomes.
     + Closing the loop was not formalized.
     + Medium level feedback
       - Provide more detail as to how the data will be used to improve student learning of the GE expected learning outcomes.
       - Provide the specific assessment methods used and make it more consistent across all sections of the course.
   * Animal Science 2367 reviewed by Julia Hawkins and Harald Vaessin
     + About 80-90% of students achieved level 2 and above on the rubric.
     + Direct methods used were essays and papers.
     + No indirect methods were provided.
     + Not clear how the data is being used.
     + Did not state the criteria for meeting the expected learning outcomes.
     + Could have been beneficial to have other faculty members review a random selection of the assignments for GE assessment.
       - In the future the Assessment Panel could consider evaluating the writing samples.
     + Regional campuses were not included.
     + Medium level feedback
       - Provide more detail on how the data is being used to improve student learning of the GE expected learning outcomes.
       - In future reports separate the data for online offerings and regional campus offerings.
   * CS-FRST 2374 reviewed by Julia Hawkins and Harald Vaessin
     + Direct methods used were quizzes and exams.
     + An end-of-year survey was given but no results were provided and the questions had no relationship to the GE expected learning outcomes.
     + Criteria for successful achievement of the GE expected learning outcomes were not provided.
     + Seems to evaluate the course goals trying to make them fit with the GE learning outcomes.
     + Medium level feedback
       - Map the assignments to each GE expected learning outcome.
       - Expand and explain how the results are being used to improve student learning of the GE expected learning outcomes.
   * Sociology 2367.02 reviewed by Julia Hawkins and Harald Vaessin
     + 4 sections of the course were assessed.
       - One of the four instructors showed progression through the course.
     + Assignments used for GE assessment were not provided making it difficult to determine if the methods used were specifically assessing the GE.
     + How the results are being used to make improvements is not provided.
     + Regional campuses were not mentioned.
     + The syllabi did not include the standard academic misconduct and disability services language.
     + A formal letter from the Panel and/or a meeting will be scheduled with the department to discuss the feedback provided in the report regarding the value of GE assessment.
   * Communication 2367 reviewed by Paul Nini
     + Direct methods were used with a criteria of successful achievement set at 70% of students achieving a score of 3 or 4 on the rubric.
     + Indirect method used was a survey.
     + Closing the loop: refining the rubric, updating the syllabus to address how the GE learning outcomes will be achieved in the course, and creating a Wiki for instructors to share.
     + High level feedback. This report can be shared as an example of a good GE assessment report.
   * ENGR 2367 reviewed by Paul Nini
     + 24 students were assessed across 12 sections.
     + Research reports were reviewed as the direct assessment method and analyzed using a scoring rubric.
     + The data was presented by assignments instead of by each GE expected learning outcome.
     + SEI’s were used as indirect assessment methods.
     + Closing the loop: focus on grading issues, update learning goals of the course, and improve assessment process.
     + Specific GE expected learning outcome data was not provided.
     + Marion campus was not included.
     + Resubmit report: separate data by each GE expected learning outcome.
   * KNISM 2210 and 2211 reviewed by Paul Nini
     + Direct assessment method used was a pre and post term paper.
     + Regional campuses were not included
     + Online courses were not mentioned.
     + Resubmit report: separate data by each GE expected learning outcome.