ASCC Assessment Panel

Approved Minutes

Monday September 11, 2017 2:00pm-3:30pm

110 Denney Hall

ATTENDEES: Jenkins, King, Lam, Nini, Oldroyd, Vaessin

Agenda:

1. Introduction and recap from previous year’s activities

* Panel decided to ask for assessment plans for course sets moving forward
  + Rationale for asking for plans: courses are not new and did not submit an assessment plan with initial approval, therefore the reports received in past typically were not high quality

1. Approval of 3-22-17 minutes

* Nini, King, approved with one abstention

1. Overview of goals and activities for upcoming year

* Review course set S4 assessment plans
* Review New GE course assessment reports
* Meet with representatives for course set S5

1. Review assessment plans (Course set S4)

* French 1103.01 and 1103.51
  + Methods address all the ELOs and relation to ELOs is clear
  + Provided examples of both indirect and direct methods of assessment
  + *Reminder: Keep in mind that the assessment plan should be implemented on regional campuses and data from regional campuses should be included in the assessment report. Data should also be shared with regional campuses as well to improve the assessment process moving forward.*
* Russian 1103.01 and 1103.51
  + Little detail of the assessment methods and the metrics for measuring the methods was given
  + **Ask for a resubmission with more detail**
    - Provide the French assessment plan as an example
* ASL 1103
  + Use a rubric for measuring outcomes
  + Pre and post tests are used
    - These questions are mapped to the ELOs
  + *Recommendation: the panel is not clear what the value of 95% submission benchmark is for the indirect method. The unit may want to consider if survey should be analyzed in relation to the responses themselves rather than the response rate*
* Chinese 1103.01 and 1103.51
  + Methods of assessment to not relate specifically to the ELOs
  + Does not provide benchmark (e.g. 80% score 3.0 or higher) for expected level of achievement
  + **Resubmit: show how methods relate to each ELO; provide indicators to gauge success for each ELO**
  + Will provide example
* Japanese 1103.01 and 1103.51
  + Methods of assessment to not relate specifically to the ELOs
  + Does not provide benchmark (e.g. 80% score 3.0 or higher) for expected level of achievement
  + **Resubmit: show how methods relate to each ELO; provide indicators to gauge success for each ELO**
  + Will provide example
* Social Work 3597
  + Methods of assessment are mapped appropriately to the ELOs
  + Panel is unclear why the expected level of achievement for ELOs 2 and 3, 60% and 50% respectively, is so low, especially relative to the expected level of achievement for ELO 1 (70%).
  + *Panel recommends raising the expected achievement level for ELOs 2 and 3. These goals should be aspirational, and the panel feels they are set too low.*
* Geography 3597.01
  + The assessment plan lacks details. Methods of assessment do not relate clearly to the ELOs. No expected level of achievement provided.
  + **Resubmit: show how methods of assessment relate to each ELO. Explain benchmarks for success and the expected level of achievement**
* Animal Science 4597
  + Criteria for expected level of achievement are very clear
  + It is not clear how the assignments relate to the ELOs
    - Example questions provided relate to key course concepts rather than GE ELOs
  + **Resubmit: provide examples of questions that relate to ELOs**
* Political Science 4597.01 and 4597.02
  + Assessment plan is the same for both courses
  + Examples for assignments were not provided
  + Expected level of achievement based on grades. No rubric provided to show how the grades will be determined
  + **Resubmit:** 
    - **Provide examples of assignments (e.g. sample essay questions) and show how these questions relate to ELOs**
    - **Provide a rubric for evaluating assignments mapped to ELOs using milestones and not grades**