ASCC Assessment Panel

Approved Minutes

Friday October 26, 2018 8:30am-10:00am

110 Denney Hall

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

1. Approval of 10-5-18 minutes

* Lam, Crocetta, **unanimously approved**

1. Review Chemistry 1110 and 1210/1220 Assessment Plan

* The panel would like to see sample questions for the direct method with an explanation of how the questions map to the ELOs
* The indirect measures reuse measures already used in the course. The department can probably pull out meaningful data as long as they map to the ELOs. The panel advises demonstrating what information is being pulled out for assessment purposes and mapping it clearly to the ELOs.
* Overall, the plan is good, but it might be more complicated than an assessment plan needs to be. The assessment panel recommends reducing the number of and/or reducing the methods used. It will make it difficult for the department to write the report if they are looking for so much information, and it will make it difficult for the panel to understand the data.
* Additional note: Syllabus for Chemistry 1220 – the department recommends putting the disability point in 16-point font.

1. Review GE Assessment Reports:
   1. German 2350

* The department did not include the assessment plan, syllabus, or rubrics used for evaluating assignments, which were mentioned in the report.
* The department had different performance levels for ELO 1 and ELO 2, but the panel is uncertain what either means, since the department did not include a rubric.
* The report did not have a “closing the loop” section (sections c-e on the assessment report requirements).
* The panel suggests including how many students were assessed out of the whole (were all students assessed, a randomized sample, etc.)
* The panel would like the see the report again with the missing elements. They are not able to evaluate without the assessment plan.
  1. ASL 1103
* The report is very thorough and clearly presented. It is clear what the department was looking for and what they did with the data.
* The panel would like a clarification where the different levels in the report (milestone, capstone, etc.) come from. If the rubric used was the ASL Expressive Test Rubric, how does this map to the levels provided in the report (milestone, capstone, etc.)? The panel recommends better aligning the rubric with the terminology used for the report in the future.
  + If the department clarifies this issue now, the panel would like to use this report as an example.
* The panel appreciates the thoroughness of the report. It seems like the department invested time in the report and gained something from doing GE assessment.
  1. Bioethics 2000
* The panel would like clarifications on the following issues (sent to Assessment Panel chair):
  + Did the department assess ELO 2 using a rubric? If so, what rubric did they use?
  + Is there a reason the department did not follow the original plan approved by the A&H panel? Does the department have a new assessment plan?
  + Does the department have more data for ELO 1 other than averages and high and low scores? The panel suspects the department met the goal of 80% of students achieving an 80% or higher, but are not certain because of the way the data is presented. It is possible that the average is 90% without 80% of students scoring 80% or higher.
* Suggestions:
  + The actions taken (section D) do not seem to be specifically relevant to the GE ELOs. For future reports, make sure that information on actions taken is specifically relevant to the GE and GE ELOs, and not just the course.