ASCC Assessment Panel

Approved Minutes

Wednesday August 29, 2018 3:45pm-5:15pm

110 Denney Hall

ATTENDEES: Crocetta, Giusti, Jenkins, Hawkins, Lam, Oldroyd, Vasey

1. Introduction and recap from previous year’s activities
* The panel reviewed:
	+ Course Set S5 assessment plans
	+ New GE reports
	+ Course Set S4 reports
* The panel requested past-due submissions from Course Set S3 and new GE reports
1. Approval of 4-25-18 minutes
* Lam, Giusti, **unanimously approved** with two abstentions
1. Overview of goals and activities for upcoming year
* The panel will continue to review:
	+ Course Set S5 assessment plans and assessment reports
	+ New GE reports
	+ Past-due submissions – both assessment plans and reports from Course Set S3 and new GE reports
1. Review assessment plans:
* English 2220
	+ The panel requested more information about the indirect method used, and the clarification the department provided is clear.
	+ The department did not address all inconsistencies in wording in the plan and the rubric (i.e. milestone vs. basic)
* Sociology 3597.01
	+ Correct the typo on the ELO 2 rubric which should say “Capstone (4)” not Capstone (3)”
	+ The panel is confused by the level of achievement indicated for the ELOs. Why does each level of achievement have its own expected level of achievement? ELO 1 indicates 75% of students Milestone 2 or higher, which is inconsistent with the levels on the rubric.
* Sociology 3549
	+ Did not list an expected level of achievement for ELO 3 for the first instructor (Reanne Frank) and ELO 2 for second instructor (Hui Zheng).
	+ The Panel recommends using consistent methods across courses so the data will be more useful in a comparison in a report. It will be difficult to compare data if the methods used are not the same. The panel strongly suggests that the department select questions that can be used across all sections of the course.
* Communication 1100 and Communication 1101
	+ The indirect method is actually a direct method for ELO 1 and ELO 2 because the methods of assessment are being directly evaluated.
	+ The panel is confused about the standard used to assess the direct method. Milestone levels are mentioned (“Both the qualitative and quantitative data will reflect if students have achieved Milestone 2…”), but it also seems that grades are used (“A minimum average of 6/8 (75%) will be the direct measure of achievement…”). If the department is using milestone levels, there should be a rubric.
* Classics 2220
	+ The panel feels that the questions provided are not entirely related to the ELOs for these GE categories. For example, for GE Literature ELO 1, student should be able to “analyze, interpret, and critique significant literary works.” The panel feels that multiple choice quizzes do not give students the opportunity to analyze and interpret literary works. The panel felt that the written assignment used for Literature ELO 2 is actually better suited for Literature ELO 1.
	+ The rubric for Literature ELO 2 has a typo. The same level skills are repeated for all four levels (“Students show impressive ability to recognize…”)
	+ Using the first 100 students alphabetically is not a random sample.