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.