ASCC Assessment Panel

Approved Minutes

Wednesday April 23, 2018 2:30pm-4:00pm

110 Denney Hall

ATTENDEES: Fink, Giusti, Hawkins, Lam, Nini, Oldroyd, Vaessin

Agenda:

1. Approval of 3-28-18 minutes

* Vaessin, Lam, **unanimously approved**

1. GE revision and GE assessment discussion (Guest: Steve Fink)

* General questions to discuss:
  + How can ASCC and panels maximize efficacy?
  + What role will Assessment Panel play in assessment?
  + Who will own and maintain GE?
  + Will existing courses roll into new GE or will they go through approval process?
  + Many of these questions have been delayed for implementation committee. Panel should determine what kinds of answers we want and advocate for them.
* Ownership of GE has still not been determined, but most support indicates it will remain in ASC. The Panel is concerned that having GE under a different college or in a committee will create gaps. It is better to have the GE under ASC and have committees and panels that are inclusive of other colleges.
* Panel member question: The GE proposal seems to indicate the GE will remain in ASC. Where is the discussion of it leaving ASC?
  + The GE Committee does not want the GE outside ASC, but everything is still on the table with implementation since the proposal has not been approved.
* If the university wants the GE to be universal, it will need consistent review. Assessment will be a method for review of the GE, and we need to determine how assessment will function. Not having an important role for assessment will diminish the strength of the GE program.
* The Panel can make a recommendation that ASC maintain ownership of the GE and maintain the role of assessing GE and its learning outcomes. A recommendation would be a joint document with ASCC.
  + The other ASCC Panels may want to weigh in on the document.
  + The recommendation may work its way to ASC Senate and perhaps beyond to implementation committee and OAA.
  + What kind of evidence would be most successful to make the case to keep assessment and course approval with ASC?
    - Approximately 85% of GE courses are ASC courses. The new model will impact these numbers, but they will largely remain under ASC.
    - ASC is essentially the liberal arts college. A GE education is a liberal arts education.
    - Make a case that ASCC is a well-run curricular body that should be maintained, and the Assessment Panel is the best body to maintain assessment under the new GE.
  + Should the Panel wait to make this recommendation or make it now?
    - It is best to make the recommendation now and not wait for more specifics to be released. The point is to make the case that the Assessment Panel is the best prepared to do assessment.
* What will happen to existing GE courses?
  + It is likely that existing GE courses that seem to meet new ELOs can go through a fast-tracked path, but they will still need approval. This will mostly apply to foundations courses.
  + The approval process for other courses will likely be more involved. Courses that are existing GE will likely not be fast-tracked for themes.
* The themes courses have a requirement that courses need to come from the three divisions (NMS, SBS, A&H). How will this work for courses from other colleges? What divisions will they fit under?
  + According to the GE committee, the three divisions are not necessarily meant to reflect the ASC divisions. However, the other colleges are unhappy with this requirement because it will make it difficult for their students to overlap courses with the GE. It will increase the course load for many students. They want to rethink the themes and distribution of credit hours.
* Is the GE seminar feasible? How will departments handle the course load?
  + One solution could be to have departments with a high GE load, like History of English, teach these courses. However, this would undermine the idea of the GE seminar being related to the students’ majors. It would take away the motivation for departments to participate.
* Many of these issues need to be spelled out before the ASC Faculty Senate votes. They cannot vote until major issues (e.g. oversight, structure, learning goals, assessment, the approval process, etc.) are resolved.
* The GE committee wants faculty committees as a resource for themes. They would work to map courses to learning goals, design syllabi, etc. They would not be an approve committee or an assessment committee.
  + These types of committees may undermine the sense of a common GE. Additionally, faculty may not even know these resources exist to help develop courses.

1. GE assessment plans: History 2202 and 2550

* The expected level of student achievement is 80% achieving the minimal level. Why didn’t the department include a smaller percentage reaching a higher benchmark as well?
* The Panel would like to see the rubric that is mentioned in appendix 2.
* There is an extensive list of assignments that could be used for each learning outcome. The Panel would like clearer examples of which assignments would be used for the course. It is up to the department how many assignments to use for assessment, but the Panel recommends limiting the number to make assessment more feasible.
  + Example assignments specific to the course would be helpful (perhaps these are included in the syllabus, but the syllabus was not attached).
* Is this plan supposed to be generic for the department to use? How will it be utilized? Will instructors select assignments from the list and assess based on this plan? Will guidance be given to the instructors? The Panel recommends creating an assessment plan that is broad and providing specific examples that faculty can adapt that includes rubrics and assignments.