ASCC Assessment Panel

Approved Minutes

Friday April 26, 2019 10:30am-12:00pm

110 Denney Hall

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

1. Approval of 2-15-19 minutes

* Crocetta, Vasey, **unanimously approved**

1. Review Engineering 2367 report

* Good job turning this around
* The mapping of ELOs to instruments makes assessment more complicated than it needs to be. Using 8 instruments means that the ELOs are not one to one.
  + In the future, the panel suggests applying tools specifically to the GE ELOs rather than extrapolating.
* The Panel noted the care that the department took to write this report, especially making it random and blind.
* The Panel suggests using rubrics that use the same scale (some assessment rubrics used a 1-4 scale and others used a 1-5 scale).
* The department clearly discussed the evidence, interpretation, and the next steps. The Panel was impressed by the clarity of the interpretation.
* The charts and visuals are very helpful for people reading this report.
* The department did not state the expected level of achievement for each ELO.
* Overall, the department made a very clear effort. The Panel will provide suggestions for future improvement.

1. Review History 2720 report

* The report contains very good data and very thoughtful ideas on how to evolve and improve the course.
* The department did not set the expected level of achievement for each ELO.
* The Panel is uncertain if the department used general rubrics or question-specific rubrics to evaluate students.
* The Panel noted that there is a potential for bias if the instructor is the one evaluating the direct methods. How should this sort of problem be addressed, not just in this class, but overall?
* The report outlines how the instructor will make this report and its findings available to others. How reports will be made available to the rest of the department should be part of best practices.

1. Discuss GE assessment and best practices

* Julia Hawkins and Shelby Oldroyd met with Kay Halasek, the director of the University Institute of Teaching and Learning (UITL) to discuss improving GE assessment
  + The Teaching Support Program (TSP) has an assessment component (all assessment, not just GE assessment). Once faculty finish the first phase of the TSP, they can start the instructional redesign step. There is an assessment component to the redesign. The final step of the TSP is to provide an assessment portfolio. Kay Halasek suggested that we encourage faculty to do the TSP while doing assessment. The TSP would be a good incentive for instructors doing GE assessment, since there is a financial bonus.
  + Also discussed working with UITL to host assessment “brown bag discussions.”
  + UITL is working on an assessment endorsement (a professional learning credential). She suggested that the assessment panel work as a support team for this endorsement.
* Julia Hawkins attended the all chairs meeting and the DUS meeting to discuss creating better pathways for assessment and to encourage chairs to give support to faculty doing assessment.
  + There wasn’t as much pushback as expected at this meeting.
  + Some departments are very supportive and use assessment as part of their research mission.
  + The Panel can also encourage the DUS of each department and other faculty to go through the TSP and assessment endorsement training.
  + ASC and the Panel need to make it clear that assessment can be very helpful for course improvement and for building courses for the new GE.
* The Panel discussed the draft documents.
  + Panel member suggestion: make bold headings and break up big text blocks with bullet points.
  + Panel member suggestion: remind instructors to utilize rubrics in Carmen with speed grader.
    - A brown bag discussion or training session on using Carmen as a tool for assessment would be useful.
    - Ideally departments would be able to import a Carmen unit for assessment.
* Best Practices for Departments document
  + Typo in point number 1: Should say “in supporting”
  + Suggestion on point number two: Say “with the department chair and faculty” rather than just faculty.
  + Suggestion: Use two separate points on GE rubrics and assessment plans.
  + Suggestion: Move the sentence in point 4 that begins “It is possible…” before the sentence beginning “We are evaluating whether…” This clarifies what it is that we are evaluating.
  + Suggestion: We need to make it clear that faculty must have a role in assessment. We are looking at academics. Staff do not teach, grade, attend classes, etc. We could also include this point in the “Mistakes to Avoid” document.
* Revised Report Requirements
  + Suggestion: Add sample questions to assessment plan requirements.
  + Suggestion: Add a clarification on point II b that student course grades and evaluations are not direct assessment methods.
  + Suggestion: Include an explanation in the report requirements for the criteria for successful achievement.
  + Suggestion: We need to ask for the data specifically, rather than a summary of the data and in addition to an interpretation of the data.
  + Suggestion: Should we include language about what do if the department needs an extension. It seems that some departments may avoid the report altogether when they do not have the resources rather than ask for an extension.
    - E.g.: This is a formal requirement for accreditation and is requirement, but please request an extension to the deadline if necessary. A non-response could jeopardize the courses GE status.
    - This could be included in the email request.
  + Suggestion: Include information on who is requesting the report and who is reviewing the report in the report requirements.
  + Suggestion: Include a link or directions to find the ASC Manual.
* Suggestion: Include information in the documents and in the report requirements on where to find support (e.g. UITL, website, Curriculum and Assessment Services, etc.)