ASCC Assessment Panel

Approved Minutes

Friday, December 11, 2015 12:30pm-2:00pm

110 Denney Hall

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

1. Approval of minutes
   * Krissek, Nini, unanimously approved
2. Review GE assessment reports
   * London Honors 2396H (GE Education Abroad) reviewed by Larry Krissek
     + Data was reported using the GE scoring rubric. Most students achieved at level 2 and 3.
     + Student papers were submitted as examples but no description of the writing prompt was provided.
       - Based on the sample papers, the assignment was clearly linked to expected learning outcome one. It is not clear if the assignment was linked to all 3 GE elos.
   * Social Work 5798.02 (GE Education Abroad) reviewed by Larry Krissek
     + Report was well done.
     + Assignment was directly related to the GE expected learning outcomes.
     + The instructor made changes from the first offering of the course which seemed to enhance student learning during this second offering of the course.
   * Arch/Landscape Arch 2300/E (new GE course reporting after 2nd offering) reviewed by Larry Krissek
     + Direct assessment methods used were paper assignments and the final exam. The criterion was set at 70% or more of students receiving a B- or better.
       - The assessment is not clearly mapped to the GE elos.
       - The Assessment Panel will revisit the approved assessment plan for this course to determine if this is an accurate representation of what the GE assessment plan was when it was approved.
     + Indirect assessment method used was a student survey but no details were provided.
   * Econ 3900.01S (GE Service Learning) reviewed by Larry Krissek
     + The writing prompt is directly linked to GE expected learning outcomes and evaluated using the GE scoring rubric.
     + Majority of students scored at a level 3 or 4.
       - 3000 level course could contribute to the high scores.
     + How the data is being used was not provided.
   * Slavic 2797.02 (GE Education Abroad) reviewed by Larry Krissek
     + The GE scoring rubric was used with most students scoring at levels 3 and 4.
     + Two end of course assignments were used as direct assessment methods.
       - Two methods: digital scrapbook and video group project.
       - Assignments were not explicitly tied to the GE elos.
       - It is not clear how the sample papers provided would be evaluated against the GE elos.
   * German 2798.02 (GE Education Abroad) reviewed by Harald Vaessin
     + Direct assessment method used was a written reflection paper.
     + Student examples were provided.
     + Discusses how the data will be used to make changes. It is clear that the instructors spent time reflecting on the GE assessment process.
     + In the future it would be beneficial for the instructor to set a threshold.
       - The Assessment Panel may consider editing the GE assessment report requirements document to include the instructor’s threshold for success.
   * International Studies 2797.02 (GE Education Abroad) reviewed by Harald Vaessin.
     + Direct assessment methods used to assess the GE elos were an end of course paper and journal entries.
     + A scoring rubric was used and the instructor provided a rationale for scoring assignments at certain levels for each elo.
       - Commend the instructor for doing this in the feedback provided.
     + A sum of how many students achieved at each level for each GE elo on a scoring rubric was not provided.
     + How the data will be used was not mentioned.
   * Chinese 2797.01 (GE Education Abroad) reviewed by Harald Vaessin
     + Student papers were written based on the GE elos.
     + Each student met or exceeded the criteria for Milestone 2.
     + How the data will be used was geared towards course improvement rather than improvement of student learning of the GE expected learning outcomes specifically.
   * History 3798.03 (GE Education Abroad) reviewed by Harald Vaessin
     + A reflection paper was used to evaluate the GE elos.
     + Student names should be removed from all assessment reports submitted.
     + A table with the number of students achieving at each level on the rubric for each GE elo was not presented.
       - Request that the report be resubmitted to include the data provided in table format.
   * ASC 2798.04 (GE Education Abroad) reviewed by Pat West and Paul Nini
     + Three sample reflection papers with the prompt were provided.
     + No threshold was set.
   * Portuguese 2798.10 (GE Education Abroad) reviewed by Pat West and Paul Nini
     + Data was provided but not presented in table form.
     + A final reflection paper was used but the prompt was not provided.
     + Student names should be removed from all assessment reports submitted.
   * ASC 2798.03 (GE Education Abroad) reviewed by Pat West and Paul Nini
     + Provided general information about the course.
     + Student examples were provided.
       - It may be beneficial for the Assessment Panel to have an explanation from instructors as to why the assignments were scored at each level.
   * History 3798.02 (GE Education Abroad) reviewed by Pat West and Paul Nini
     + Student names should be removed from all assessment reports submitted.
     + Instead of focusing on course improvements to be made, the instructor should provide ways in which the data will be used to improve student learning of the GE learning outcomes specifically rather than how the course will improved.
   * English 4567S (GE Service Learning) reviewed by Pat West and Paul Nini
     + The data provided was not complete. It was not broken down by each GE elo and provided using the scoring rubric.
     + It’s not clear that the direct assessment method used is directly linked to the GE elos.
     + The closing the loop section of the report could be improved.
     + Student names should be removed from all assessment reports submitted.