ASCC Assessment Panel

Approved Minutes

Wednesday September 19, 2018 3:45pm-5:15pm

110 Denney Hall

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

1. Approval of 8-29-18 minutes
* Lam, Crocetta, unanimously approved
1. Review GE Assessment plans:
	* Agricultural Communication 2367
		1. The rubrics provided are not clearly labeled – which rubrics are used for each ELO? If the department is using grading rubrics, they need to clearly indicate which part applies to GE evaluation.
		2. For the second writing ELOs, the expected level is a B or higher. How do they translate the provided rubrics into a grade?
		3. The assessment plan still mentions “self-reflection” and “respect and tolerance.” How are these measured?
		4. Send the plan back with a sample assessment plan. The department can also meet with Julia Hawkins if they would find this helpful.
	* German 3252
		1. The Panel asked for sample questions for the GE Assessment Plan. The department provided appropriate sample questions.
2. Review GE Reports (New GE courses)
	* Linguistics 2052H
		1. It appears that the scores that are being compared are from different assignments (grades from two different synopses). Using different assignments for comparisons creates noise.
		2. The rubric is a grading rubric. It is not an assessment rubric and does not relate directly to the GE ELOs.
		3. The Panel recommends revising the GE plan if course is offered in the future. The panel recommends developing an assessment rubric, and using a different direct method of assessment.
	* English 2463
		1. The first GE VPA ELO is “Students analyze, appreciate, and interpret significant works of art.” The report indicates, “Over 90% of students scored 80% or more” on the direct method for the GE ELO. The report also indicates, “Some students were unsure as to whether video games are “significant works of art.” The panel believes that this is a central problem that needs to be addressed. It is difficult to say that 90% of students reached were able to appropriately “analyze, appreciate, and interpret significant works of art” if those students did not agree that video games are significant works of art. How does the department intend on addressing this problem?
		2. The direct assessment appears to be grading. How were the assignments evaluated relative to the GE ELOs? If the department does not have a GE rubric, the panel recommends developing one for future assessment purposes. If the department did use a rubric or another method of directly evaluating the GE ELOs, please provide this to the panel
	* History of Art 3010H
		1. SEIs do not address ELOs and are not specifically relevant to GE assessment. They may be instructive for course improvement in general, but they do not need to be included in a GE assessment report.
		2. How were the assignments evaluated relative to the GE ELOs? What was the criteria for evaluation, and how were the classifications (excellent, good, fair, poor) chosen. GE Assessment should be specific to GE ELOs, not to grades. Did the department use a rubric?
	* History of Art 3901
		1. The report gives very specific criteria for the evaluation of GE VPA ELO1, but not for other ELOs. The other ELOs appear to be grades on assignments.
		2. What was the expected level of achievement for each ELO? The Results look good overall, but the panel is not certain how the results compared to department’s expectations.
		3. The report is good overall, but the department should provide expected level of achievement and more detailed sample questions from quizzes to show how the assignments related to the ELOs.