ASCC Assessment Panel

Approved Minutes

Monday September 25, 2017 2:00pm-3:30pm

352 Denney Hall

ATTENDEES: King, Lam, Nini, Oldroyd, Vaessin

Agenda:

1. Approval of 9-11-17 minutes

* Lam, Vaessin, unanimously approved

1. Review English departmental assessment plan

* The direct measure of assessment is very specific. A rubric for evaluating the direct method was included in the assessment plan, and it maps well to the ELOs.
* The indirect measure is a student survey, which will measure the students’ confidence in their writing abilities.

1. Review Course set S4 reports

* Econ 4597
  + The Assessment Panel requested a plan to review before the submission of a report. Please submit a plan for the Panel to review.
  + When drafting an assessment plan, please consider the following comments from the Panel about the assessment report:
    - The assignments provided do not make it clear how the assessment methods relate to the ELOs. More clearly map the assignments to the ELOs so it is obvious to the Panel how these assignments are relevant to the GE ELOs
    - The grading rubric should also be relevant to the ELOs.
    - The assessment report uses an extra credit assignment for assessment. Consider using an assignment that is required for all students, since assessment should include all students.
    - SEI comments are used for an indirect method of assessment. While this can be informative for overall course improvement, SEIs are not recommended, as they do not relate directly to the ELOs. Indirect measures are optional and additional to direct measures, so it is ultimately up to the unit to decide, but surveys that directly relate to the ELOs can be more informative.
* Sociology 3597.01
  + The Assessment Panel would like to remind the department that course grades reflect an integrated outcome but also the overall course achievement. The purpose GE assessment is to separate course goals and GE ELOs and looks at achievement for just the GE ELOs. A student could theoretically perform well in a course but not learn the GE ELOs or vice versa.
  + The Assessment Panel requested a plan to review before the submission of a report. Please submit a plan for the Panel to review.
  + When drafting an assessment plan, please consider the following comments from the Panel about the assessment report
    - Was there a rubric used to determine the achievement for the ELOs? Data provided in the report is broken down by 4 levels, but Panel is uncertain how this data was gathered.
    - According to this report, no students scored above Milestone 2. How does the department consider this a success? The department did not indicate the expected level of student achievement or how this compared to what was expected of students.
    - The department did not indicate how they intended to improve GE assessment moving forward.
  + The Panel would also like to remind the department that the university considers in-person and distance learning courses to be equivalent. If a GE course is offered via a distance learning option, it should affect the achievement of the GE ELOs.

1. Review new GE course reports

* History 2066
  + **The Panel is uncertain how the rubric provided in appendix 3 translates to the 5-point scale mentioned in the report. In the appendix, the rubric uses percentages. Furthermore, the Panel is uncertain how this relates to each individual ELO. Please provide clarification of how the assignment was evaluated based on each ELO.**
  + The Panel felt that the rubric provided in appendix 2 was well suited for evaluating assignments based on ELOs.
* Sociology 5450
  + A similar comment on course grades from the assessment report for Sociology 3597.
  + Assessment report is clear on the assessment methods used and how these methods relate to the ELOs.
  + **Panel is uncertain how the assignments were evaluated to come up with the data on page 2 of the report. Please provide the rubric or other method of evaluating the assignments.**
* Psych 1200
  + The department does not use any direct measures. Students are asked to measure their own understanding of the ELOs. This is a good indirect measure, but it is not an appropriate direct measure.
  + The achievement of each ELO starts out very high to begin with. The Panel wonders if the department is using a measure that might be too low for the students if they have nearly mastered the ELO before the semester.
  + The report does not include all the ELOs.
  + **Please resubmit a report in Summer 2018 that addresses the points above.**
* German 2798.02
  + Explains both the direct and indirect methods used for all ELOs
  + Sample assignments are provided.
  + Data indicates there is room for improvement. The Panel was satisfied with how the department indicates they will try to improve the course to see better achievement of ELOs.
  + Overall, the Panel was impressed with the quality of the report.
* Pharmacy 2367
  + The panel felt the report was well-done.
  + The department provided a rubric that was used for evaluating the assignments.
  + The assignments are appropriate and relate well to the ELOs.
* Philosophy 2465
  + Provides assignments for each ELO and pre and post-test data for each ELO.
  + Provides rubric used to evaluate assignments based on ELOs.
  + Inform the department that while it was not required for this report, they may want to consider what they will do with the assessment data (next steps to improve course, communicating findings with the department, etc.) and what their benchmark for success is for each ELO.
* Slavic 4800
  + The assessment report and the assessment appendix appear to be identical. The Assessment Panel would like to evaluate the report with all the information included before providing feedback.
  + As is, the report did not provide methods for evaluating the ELOs (rubrics or other method).
  + The department is not specific about how they measure the direct methods.