ASCC Assessment Panel

Approved Minutes

Monday December 12, 2016 3:00pm-4:30pm

110 Denney Hall

ATTENDEES: Hawkins, Hogle, King, Krissek, Nini

Agenda:

1. Approval of 10-31-16 Minutes
   * King, Krissek, unanimously approved
2. Course-set report reviews
   * History 2797.02 (new GE course)
     + Study abroad course offered through the Mansfield campus.
     + No data for the GE expected learning outcomes was provided.
     + The History department submitted a departmental report a couple of years prior. Perhaps there is a communication gap since this course is offered at a regional campus.
     + Feedback to instructor: send the History departmental report previously submitted and request that the instructor follow a similar plan for GE assessment in the future.
       - Make sure to provide GE specific data with the assessment methods directly aligned to the GE expected learning outcomes.
   * ESCE 2189S (new GE course)
     + All campuses were assessed and data was provided separately.
     + Columbus campus provided more in-depth reflection.
     + The Newark campus showed that the same number of students achieved at each level on the rubric for each expected learning outcome.
     + For future reporting: show how the activities completed for assessment are connected to the GE expected learning outcomes.
   * Public Health 2010 (new GE course)
     + Report was very well done. Lots of assessment methods were used, the expectation was clearly stated, and the closing the loop section of the report was impressive.
     + A lot of students were at the higher end of the scoring rubric.
     + Not all students that take the course are fulfilling a GE requirement. Some of the students may be majors in the program. Since there is no way to determine which students are taking the course for the GE, the data merges together all of the students.
     + SEI is provided as an indirect measure.
     + In the feedback, mention that SEIs are not a good form of indirect assessment.
   * Political Science 3780 (new GE course)
     + Very well done.
     + Direct and indirect measures were used.
     + Set expectation of achievement (75% of students achieve 70% or higher).
     + In the feedback, the department should be reminded that all instructors need to include the GE language on the syllabus.
   * Anthropology 2200/2200H, 2201/2201H, and 2202/2202H (course set S3)
     + The report was very well done.
     + All versions of the course were assessed (online, honors, and regional campuses).
     + The department is meeting with instructors to make adjustments.
   * Econ 2001.01/2001.03H and 2002.01/2202.03H (course set S3)
     + For direct assessment methods, pre and post tests were used to assess the elos.
     + For indirect assessment, the SEI was used. In the feedback, mention that SEIs are not a good form of indirect assessment.
     + How the data will be used to improve student learning was not clear.
     + The report was well done and provided data for each GE expected learning outcome.
   * HDFS 2200 (course set S3)
     + A 4-level scoring rubric was used for direct assessment.
     + Provided next steps to improve student learning.
     + The report was very well done and provided everything that was requested.
   * Human Nutrition 2210 (course set S3)
     + It was not clear how many sections of the course were offered and assessed.
     + A 4-level scoring rubric was used for direct assessment of each expected learning outcome.
     + Next steps for using the data to improve student learning needs to be improved. Remind department of this when sending the feedback.