ASCC 12/2/2016

200 Bricker Hall 8:30-10:30am

Approved Minutes

# ATTENDEES: Aski, Bernhagen, Bitters, Carlson, Daly, Fink, Fletcher, Haddad, Heckler, Heysel, Hogle, Jenkins, King, Kline, Krissek, Lam, Oldroyd, Savage, Vaessin, Valerio, Vankeerbergen

1. Approval of 11-4-16 minutes
	* Krissek, King, unanimously approved
2. SEI Presentation (Vice-Provost Wayne Carlson)
	* The SEI subcommittee is charged with reviewing and making recommendations for the SEIs.
	* When the SEI went from being done on paper in the classroom to being done online, the response rate dropped about 30%.
	* Recommendations from the committee include developing a communication plan to stress the importance of the SEIs to students, for faculty to provide time for students to complete the survey in-class, and ways to improve reporting the data which can be done by organizing the questions into three categories.
		+ The three categories include: 1) rapport and instructor commitment. 2) instructor’s preparedness, organization of material, and clarity of presentation. 3) students’ sense of their own learning.
	* Faculty rules do not require the SEI to be used. Therefore, some departments have created their own survey for students to complete.
	* Only question number 10 on the SEIs are made public. Question number 10 is: overall, I rate the instructor (excellent to poor).
		+ Students have requested that the results for all of the questions be reported.
		+ Committee recommendation is to group the questions into categories and report the results of the 3 categories in addition to question 10.
	* Faculty concern: responses are used for faculty evaluations and there is evidence that there are biases in responses from students. In addition, SEIs do not measure student learning gains.
	* The Teaching and Learning Institute will continue conversations about the SEIs.
3. Panel updates & Conversation about GE reporting rubrics
	* SBS Panel
		+ SHS 7825 - approved
		+ Sociology - 3597.02 approved with contingency
		+ Political Science 7410 – approved with contingency
		+ Began developing GE assessment rubrics for the Social Science categories.
	* A&H1
		+ AAAS 2300 – approved with contingency
		+ AAAS 2367.02 – approved with contingency
		+ English 2367.01 – approved with contingency
		+ English 2367.02 – approved with contingency
		+ Hebrew 3705 – approved with contingency
		+ History 3706 – approved
		+ History 3798.05 – approved
		+ NELC 3625.02 – approved
		+ Russian 1133.01 – approved
		+ Russian 3470 – approved with contingency
		+ Slavic 3333 – approved with contingency
	* A&H 2
		+ History 3376 - approved
		+ Music 4665 - approved
		+ AAAS 7507 - approved
	* Assessment
		+ Continuing to review GE assessment reports.
	* NMS Panel
		+ Animal Science 2200.01 – approved
		+ Animal Science 2300H – approved
	* GE reporting rubrics
		+ ULAC is discussing a new model for the GE program in which the way assessment is done could change. However, there is a good chance that the program will just slightly change with the assessment process being similar. Regardless, GE assessment needs to be continued. A more streamlined way of doing assessment and more conversation around what is meant by the GE expected learning outcomes is helpful no matter what changes happen to the GE program.
		+ The current conversation surrounding the assessment rubrics has been focused on what the language of the expected learning outcomes actually mean and what it would mean to achieve them at 4 different levels.
			- Using Blooms Taxonomy language has been useful.
		+ The rubrics will also assist the Panels when reviewing GE course proposals.
		+ Ensures that course grades are not used as a form of GE assessment.
		+ When developing the rubrics, it is important to make sure that the capstone level could be accomplished by students.