ASCC Assessment Panel

Approved Minutes

Friday, November 20, 2015 12:30pm-2:00pm

110 Denney Hall

ATTENDEES: Hogle, Krissek, Lin, Nini, Vaessin

1. Approval of 10-23-15 Minutes
	* Krissek, Lin, unanimously approved
2. Review GE assessment reports
	* Departmental Psychology report reviewed by Larry Krissek and Jialin Lin
		+ Psychology 1100
			- Report was very well done. The assessment included multiple sections and online offerings.
			- Direct assessment methods used were reflection papers scored using a rubric and embedded questions on exams.
			- The threshold was set at 70% of students receiving a good or excellent level on papers and an average of 70% of students getting the embedded questions correct.
				* This threshold was met for almost all GE expected learning outcomes.
			- A student survey was administered for indirect methods.
			- The communication piece of the report and closing the loop section were very well done.
				* Students are provided with a report after exams showing how they performed on the GE specific questions.
				* Instructors receive training and feedback on how well their course materials address the GE ELO’s with mandatory meetings.
				* Instructors were trained on the exam software used for embedded testing and discussed ways to improve practices.
				* The focus moving forward will be on GE Social Science ELO 3 by having instructor meetings and professional development sessions.
			- No data from regional campuses was provided.
			- High level feedback
				* One of the best reports received
				* Need to provide regional campus GE assessment data
		+ Psychology 1100H
			- Pre-/post-test was used for direct assessment and met the threshold for expected learning outcomes one and two with improvement shown for all items except for one.
				* No data was provided for elo 3.
			- Student survey was used as an indirect method.
			- No direct measures were provided for the GE Social Diversity category that the course fulfills.
			- Data from regional campuses were not provided.
			- Medium to high level feedback. There was great effort but data was missing for the GE Social Diversity category and expected learning outcome three of the Social Science category.
		+ Psychology 2367.01
			- The report focused on the GE Social Science category. The department has a GE assessment process in place in which they collect data for each GE category in alternate years so no data was provided in this report for the GE Writing and Communication Level Two category.
			- A random sample of about 300 papers were reviewed by independent graders using a GE focused scoring rubric.
				* It’s clear that the department takes GE assessment seriously as this requires a significant effort.
				* 70% or more of the students scored a 4 or 5 on the rubric.
			- Embedded testing on essay exams was also done for direct assessment.
				* The goal of 70% of students scoring a 4 or 5 on the rubric was reached for learning outcomes two and three but was not met for learning outcome one.
			- A student survey was used for indirect assessment.
			- Regional campus data was not provided.
			- Actions taken and next steps
				* The goal for the next year is to provide specific feedback to students about their results for the GE Social Science expected learning outcomes.
				* The department mapped the course content to the GE expected learning outcomes to clearly identify what links to the GE elos.
				* Embedded testing will be expanded.
			- Medium level feedback. Did not provide data for GE Writing and Communication Level 2.
	* SOC 4000H reviewed by Larry Krissek and Jialin Lin
		+ Report was submitted for GE Service Learning assessment and was very well done.
		+ It is evident that GE assessment has been taken seriously by these instructors.
		+ High level feedback.
	* ESHESA 2577 reviewed by Harald Vaessin
		+ Report was submitted after the second offering of the course as a newly approved GE course.
		+ Provided a GE specific scoring rubric that was used to evaluate the final papers.
		+ Future plans include implementing the assessment method at the beginning of the course and at the end of the course.
		+ Expected criterion for achievement was not provided.
		+ Medium level feedback
			- Details on how the data will be used to improve student learning of the GE expected learning outcomes should be included.
			- Suggestion: use indirect methods in addition to direct methods.
	* English 2367.01 and 2367.02 reviewed by Harald Vaessin
		+ Very well done and included data from five campuses.
		+ Direct assessment was done by collecting a sample of pre- and -post surveys as well as randomly selected essays. Both methods were evaluated using scoring rubrics.
			- There was no significant change in the findings from the pre- to the post- survey but one elo showed a decrease in scores. However, there was not much detail provided to show how the data would be used to improve student learning of the expected learning outcome.
		+ The oral component of elo 2 of the GE Writing and Communication Level 2 category was not addressed in this report but it is included on the department’s timeline for future GE assessment.
		+ High level feedback.
	* HDFS 2367 reviewed by Paul Nini
		+ Report was very well done.
		+ No indirect methods were provided (not required).
		+ Several methods were used for direct assessment and scored on a 4 point scale.
		+ The oral component of the expected learning outcome was assessed using a debate assignment.
		+ Medium/high level feedback
			- Encourage unit to look more closely at how the data could be used to improve student learning of the GE expected learning outcomes.
	* ESHESA 2571S reviewed by Paul Nini
		+ GE Service Learning course with multiple instructors.
		+ The report was very well done.
		+ Provided data for each GE expected learning outcome specifically using a rubric.
		+ Medium/high level feedback with a suggestion to reflect on the data and determine how to use it in order to improve student learning of the GE expected learning outcomes.