ASCC Assessment Panel

Approved Minutes

Friday October 5, 2018 8:30am-10:00am

110 Denney Hall

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

1. Approval of 9-19-18 minutes

* Lam, Giusti, approved with one abstention

1. Review GE Assessment reports:

* Comparative Studies 3692
  + The data and direct measures are very appropriate and clear
  + Suggestion for future reports: align language from rubric (e.g. novice, intermediate, etc.) with language in the report (e.g. excellent, good, etc.).
  + Overall, the report is very well done
* Sociology 3200
  + The data is presented clearly
  + The department provided examples of student assignments
    - Did not provide a rubric or another method of evaluating the assignments. A rubric would be more general and clear to understand. The examples are illustrative but a method of evaluation (e.g. a rubric) would show the panel why the examples are a capstone or milestone 2.
  + The department did not provide expected level of achievement for each ELO. Did the course meet expectations? It is unclear how the data aligns with the assessment plan standards.
  + In the future, be clear about the department’s expectations and show how the assignments were evaluated relative to the ELOs.
* Modern Greek 2240
  + Did not provide any specific data or summary of data on GE ELO achievement.
  + The panel recommends using a rubric or method other than grades for evaluating assignments for a GE assessment report, because factors other than GE ELO achievement impact grades.
  + The panel would like to see a report with data that is not evaluated based on grades. The department/instructor can either use data from the past semester of from the next offering.
    - Will provide an example of effective report and plan
* Russian 2345
  + The panel believes the assessment plan is very strong overall, but the plan should include the expected level of achievement for each ELO
    - The panel also recommends using consistent levels in the rubrics (either 3 or 4 levels for all ELOs) and consistent language (novice, intermediate, advanced, superior, etc.) for each ELO. This allows for better comparison of achievement.
  + The panel understands that the department had some difficulties with the offering, so they would like to see a new report with the relevant data (either from a previous offering or from a new offering).
  + Student evaluation data should also be included in the report if it was used as in indirect measure.
* Public Affairs 2367
  + The report has specific data and focuses on the ELOs. The panel appreciates the interpretation section and future actions.
  + For any future reports, the panel would like to see the assessment plan, a syllabus, and the method of evaluation (e.g. a rubric) in an appendix for context.
    - If the department would like to provide the assessment plan for this report, the assessment panel would like to use this report as a model.
* Astronomy 1102
  + The panel was impressed with the department’s efforts to meet the needs of students in an online platform
  + The report appears to be an evaluation of the course, not of the GE ELOs. The panel would like to see a new report that address the following points:
    - The report uses grades for assignments that are not specific to the GE ELOs. The assessment plan has sample exam questions that are relevant to the GE ELOs. The panel recommends using these questions in a pre and posttest, as is mentioned in the plan.
    - The assessment plan mentions pre and post-testing, but it is not clear if this method was actually used in the report. It appears that homework was also used, but was evaluated based on course goals and not on GE ELOs.
    - The assessment plan and report do not include the expected level of achievement for each ELO.