ASCC Assessment Panel

Approved Minutes

Wednesday February 21, 2018 2:30pm-4:00pm

110 Denney Hall

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

Agenda:

1. Approval of 1-24-18 minutes
* Lam, Nini, **unanimously approved**
1. Assessment plans for CS5:
	1. Stats 2480
* The Assessment Panel was impressed with the GE Assessment Plan.
* Sample questions provided are appropriate for the ELOs and level of achievement is clear.
	1. Classics 1101
* The methods of assessment are appropriate and the rubrics provided are clear.
* The sample questions clearly relate to the ELOs.

* 1. German 3252
* The rubrics, expected level of achievement and methods of achievement are clear.
* The Panel would like to see sample questions for the essay and take-home exam that will be used for the direct methods in the final draft of the GE Assessment Plan to see how they relate to the ELOs.
	1. AgrComm 2367
* The rubrics provided for evaluating discussion board posts and for evaluating the research paper are grading rubrics. They do not relate specifically to the GE ELOs. A GE rubric is recommended because grades consider factors other than achievement of the GE ELOs.
* The discussion board posts are a direct method for GE Social Diversity in the US and an indirect method for GE Second Writing. It should be used as a direct method, because students are being directly evaluated.
* The Panel feels that the expected level of achievement (100%) may be too high for GE Social Diversity in the US. Additionally, the Panel felt that the level of achievement for both ELO 1 and ELO 2 are very subjective. How are these goals measured? How does demonstrating tolerance to other students’ attitudes relate to a recognition of the role of social diversity in shaping attitudes?
* The Panel finds the expected level of achievement for GE Second Writing confusing. Could this possibly be rephrased to eliminate confusion?
* The Panel did not see the discussion board questions in the syllabus provided. Can the department provide examples of the assignments relevant to the GE ELOs?
	1. Linguistics 2051
* The GE ELOs should be specifically stated in the GE Assessment Plan.
* The Panel recommends using questions that can be or are used on required in-class assignments. Students may not put their best effort into questions if they are not required for their grade, giving an inaccurate picture of their GE ELO level of achievement.
* The Panel feels that the questions used in the quiz are too simplistic and do not relate to course material that would be covered in a Linguistics course. The methods of assessment should demonstrate that the GE ELOs are being met within the context of the course.
	+ The Panel recommends matching questions from existing assignments to the ELOs, which will also show students meeting the ELOs on differentiated levels.
* Given that the questions are quite basic, the Panel felt the level of expected achievement was also too low.
	+ More levels of achievement would help fix this issue. The current GE Assessment Plan assumes 75% of students will achieve a lower level of achievement. The department could also indicate that a smaller percentage should reach a higher level of achievement.
* Send Stats 2480 and Animal Science 2260 as examples
	1. English 2220
* The Panel was impressed with the GE Assessment Plan overall.
* The Panel recommends using consistent language in the section of “level of student achievement expected for the GE ELO” and on the rubric itself. The rubric uses “benchmark, milestone, etc.” but the expected level of achievement says “basic” and “level 3.”
* When submitting the final version of the GE Assessment Plan, the Assessment Panel would like clarification for how the indirect method will be used. It is currently unclear how the Department plans to use the data from the evaluation.
	1. Animal Science 2260
* The Assessment Panel was very impressed with the GE Assessment Plan.
* The questions are appropriate to each ELO and vary in difficulty.