ASCC Assessment Panel

Approved Minutes

Friday February 15, 2018 10:30am-12:00pm

110 Denney Hall

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

1. Approval of 1-18-19 minutes
* Vasey, Lam, **unanimously approved**
1. Review German 2350 report
* The report looks very good overall.
* The department implemented the approved assessment plan.
* They provided and interpretation for the data that was collected and have plans for improvements based on their findings.
* Recommendation: The department might want to standardize the levels used in the rubrics in appendix 3 and appendix 4. Having 4 levels for ELO 1 and 5 levels for ELO 2 can be somewhat confusing when comparing outcomes.
1. Review ASC 2798.05 report
* It does seem like students had a very valuable experience.
* Does not include instructor reflection, interpretation or “closing the loop”
* The samples provided do not indicate what level they were placed in (e.g. good, excellent, etc.)
* A syllabus was not provided.
* Why weren’t all students evaluated? The reflection paper is a mandatory assignment. Was there a rationale for not evaluating all the papers?
* Suggestion: In the future, 100% of students should be included in the evaluation or there should be a rationale for not including all students. Additionally, it should be made clear which level the provided examples fall under.
1. Discuss GE assessment and best practices
* Julia will present at the all-chairs meeting, which the divisional deans also attend. The goal is to get chairs on-board with assessment. Any advice on how to lead this discussion and how to explain why chairs are important to the assessment process?
	+ Will likely hear pushback at this meeting and others regarding why we are focusing on assessment now with changes in the GE on the horizon.
		- The GE will change, but assessment will not go away. It will likely become more important.
		- Doing assessment now will help departments understand what they need to change and can change under the new GE.
	+ There will always be pushback from some departments, but the positive aspects of assessment should be made clear to chairs.
		- Assessment should show not just what the department did to collect data but what they did with the data to improve the course. These kind of improvements are important to chairs.
		- A good GE assessment structure is beneficial to all courses. It helps to establish an assessment structure and mindset.
		- Some departments feel threatened by the GE revisions because they believe GE status might be lost. If departments are not willing to do GE assessment to demonstrate that their courses meet the learning outcomes, they should not complain about these risks.
		- There is also pushback from non-faculty (parents, students, non-academics, etc.) about the value of the GE. This is how we demonstrate the value of the GE.
		- Assessment has two parts: assessing if goals are being met and reflection on what improvements can be made. There is a push from UITL on reflection, and assessment can play a role in teaching in a reflective manner.
* Does anyone have suggestions for resources for developing best practices or providing models?
	+ Assessment Clear and Simple
	+ Assessment Essentials: Planning, Implementing, Improving
		- This has better models than Assessment Clear and Simple
	+ Make a suggestion to Meg and Steve to find money for these resources to provide to departments. Every department should have access to these resources.
	+ We can use any copies we have to find excerpts and models for the website.
* Suggestion: Can we use Carmen as a resource? We could develop a model to show a step-by-step guide to walk departments through the process with links to relevant models. We are losing departments in the same places all the time (e.g. no rubrics, no “closing the loop”)
* Meeting with Kay Halasek to discuss creating an assessment module in the Teacher Support Program.
* Julia and Shelby are developing best practices documents and are discussing methods for improving the assessment process.
	+ Multiple best practices documents will need to be created (e.g. for new panel members, for creating assessment plans, for writing reports)
	+ In the future, chairs should come to meetings with departmental representatives for assessment.
	+ Currently there aren’t any consequences (e.g. losing GE status) if departments do not do GE reports.
		- Recertification will be part of the new GE. Proper assessment will likely be a requirement for recertification. Assessment and curricular drift are two main reasons why GE courses should be recertified.
		- For departments that repeatedly fail to submit assessment reports, we can involve assistant deans and divisional deans. Chairs need to be involved in more of these requests as well.
		- We can offer the opportunity for departments to provide clear justification if they cannot provide assessment reports at the time requested.
	+ How do we make it clear to instructors and departments that we are not evaluating instructors or course content?
		- Having a mission statement, which is included in assessment requests, could possibly help. It could clearly state the goal of GE assessment in a positive and less theoretical way.
		- Need to clearly state “GE assessment” in GE assessment report requirements and in Qualtrics.
		- It is difficult for people to be objective. They often use “I feel” and “I think” statements even though we are requesting data and interpretation.
		- We don’t want instructors to waste their time with non-GE assessment things.
			* We should address the common pitfalls (e.g. how instructors feel, reports not using rubrics, SEIs, etc.). We should explain what should be avoided and why.
			* Suggestion: Create a fake bad report with the common pitfalls and annotate it. This way, we are not calling out any departments specifically but still providing an example of what to avoid.
* Qualtrics will standardize the assessment submission process and hopefully help to avoid some of these pitfalls.
	+ Present Qualtrics at future meeting
	+ Using Qualtrics will require the standardization of the report requirements.
	+ We need to formalize changes in the report requirements. We should discuss wording and an implementation schedule. It should be voted on at this panel and at ASCC.