ASCC Assessment Panel

Approved Minutes

Wednesday, September 25, 2019 9:30am-11:00am

105 Bricker Hall

ATTENDEES: Hawkins, Lam, Miriti, Oldroyd, Rush

1. Approval of 9-11-19 minutes

* Lam, Rush, approved with one abstention

1. Review GE assessment reports:
   1. History of Art 2003

* It is unclear what direct methods were used. Both course grades and embedded questions were mentioned. The report did not clarify what methods were used for each ELO. The report did not provide example embedded questions. Additionally, course grades and assignment grades are typically not appropriate for GE assessment, since they evaluate more than the ELOs.
* SEIs were provided, which is not advised since they do not address the ELOs.
* The actions taken to improve the course are thorough and extensive. Some of these actions are not clearly related to the ELOs or improving student achievement of the ELOs.
* Unclear how many students are taking the class.
* The Panel would like the department to resubmit the report, either with new data collection or with data collected for this report and evaluated based on ELOs only.
* Recommendations for improvement:
  + Simplify data collection and use the same direct method for all sections of the course.
  + This report is more an assessment of the instructor than of the GE ELOs. A GE assessment report is not intended to evaluate the instructor or the course goals. Only assess the GE ELOs.
  1. ASC 2798
* There is no data provided in the report.
* The instructor used a grading rubric instead of the GE rubric provided in the manual for GE Education Abroad courses.
* The prompts for the assignments were not provided, so the Panel could not evaluate if the assignment was related to the GE ELOs.
* The Panel requested a new report. The report could use the existing assignment from the most recent course offerings if the GE rubric is used and the data is provided.
  1. Social Work 1140
* The report is well-done overall.
* The department is currently revising the course.
* The department used appropriate direct methods and a GE scoring rubric.
* Recommendations for future reports:
  + Explain why the department chose the expected level of achievement.
  + Since the department looked for percentages for the expected level of achievement, providing percentages as well as the raw data would be helpful.
  + The report says, “Moving forward, we would like to create a less cumbersome direct assessment method that does not require instructors to complete additional rubrics in addition to the assignment grading rubrics.” The Panel recommends continuing to use the GE scoring rubric, even if that means integrating it into the grading rubric. Directly evaluating the GE ELOs separately from the assignment grade is essential for quality GE assessment.