ASCC Assessment Panel

Approved Minutes

Friday November 9, 2018 8:30am-10:00am

110 Denney Hall

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

1. Approval of 10-5-18 minutes

* Lam, Vasey, **unanimously approved**

1. Review assessment reports:
   1. English 1110

* The panel found the report to be excellent overall.
* It seems that the English Department put significant effort into the report and gained something from it as well.
* The panel was impressed that the department trained staff to assess the course for GE purposes.
* The panel also commends the department for shifting the pedagogical focus of the course to better meet the needs of students.
* The panel asked for two points of clarification:
  + How did the department arrive at the number of 195 student essays as a representative sample? How many students were in the courses overall?
  + Why didn’t the department do evaluations in the spring of 2018?
  1. Sociology 3798.03
* The course is a study abroad course in Rwanda which focuses on the Rwandan genocide.
* It seems the instructor takes both the course and GE assessment seriously.
* The panel asked for two points of clarification:
  + A rubric was mentioned on the first page of the report, but one was not included in the assessment report. Without the rubric, it is not clear how the assignments were evaluated in relation to the Expected Learning Outcomes (ELOs).
  + The expected level of achievement was unclear in the report.
  1. Religious Studies 3672
* The instructor seems to have made a good-faith effort, but does not seem to understand GE assessment.
  + GE status is not provisional. GE assessment occurs after the second offering to make sure that courses are meeting the ELOs and to provide evidence of GE requirements for accreditation.
* The questions for evaluating the ELOs copy the language of the ELOs almost verbatim, but only ask students to provide examples rather than to analyze and/or evaluate. There should be some content relationship with embedded questions.
* A rubric is mentioned but not attached. The panel was unable to tell what the levels (e.g. excellent, good, etc.) mean.
* The explanation of level of student achievement provided on page 14 is not necessarily useful. It is essentially expected that students will only achieve 75% of the GE ELOs.
* The assessment plan mentions an “analysis of a semester-long discussion and journal” as a direct measure, but does not provide any data or method of evaluating this.

1. Review Linguistics 2051 revised assessment plan

* The revised plan addressed the concerns from the original feedback.
  + Have two levels of achievement rather than only basic questions.
  + Questions are more closely related to content of course.
  + Assignments are not optional and will be more representative.
* The data in the report will likely not be straightforward since multiple questions are associated with each ELO.