ASCC Assessment Panel

Approved Minutes

Wednesday, November 6, 2019 9:30am-11:00am

105 Bricker Hall

ATTENDEES: Hawkins, Lam, Miriti, Oldroyd, Rush, Samuels

1. Approval of 9-25-19 minutes
* Lam, Rush, **approved** with one abstention
1. Review Religious Studies 3666 assessment report
* The direct measures are based on essay grades. Specific questions were chosen to evaluate each ELO, but the grades given appear to be scored on more than simple ELO achievement.
* Averages were provided for the essay grades, but not specific data. Providing averages only can show skewed data if there is a high or low outlier.
* It is unclear what “undergraduate mastery level” is for the expected level of achievement. The Panel suggests using a more specific measure or defining what this level is.
* The question used to evaluated ELO 2 for the Diversity: Global Studies category does not clearly relate to international diversity. It seems that the course content clearly relates to international diversity and that a more relevant question could have been chosen.
* A syllabus should be submitted with assessment reports.
* The indirect measures seemed to provide good feedback from the students.
1. Indirect assessment discussion
* The Panel discussed the value of requesting indirect assessment for assessment reports, especially with lack of guidance for designing indirect assessment.
	+ Students are usually overconfident in their assessment of their abilities. Is it helpful to know that they believe they achieved an ELO at a higher level than what is demonstrated by the direct measure?
	+ Sometimes there is value in knowing there is a gap between actual achievement and perceived achievement. Instructors can work to bridge this gap.
	+ It is unclear if indirect measures are used to demonstrate achievement of the ELOs for accreditation purposes.
* The Panel decided to discuss this issue further when discussing best practices at a future meeting.
1. Qualtrics presentation and discussion
* The Panel discussed the use of Qualtrics for submitting GE assessment reports.
* Shelby Oldroyd presented the Qualtrics survey that was designed by the ASCCAS office. The survey will be distributed by email to departments to fill out. Certain questions in the survey are “forced response,” so departments will not be able to leave essential information blank. Having a uniform reporting process will help the Panel develop category-level reports and provide opportunities for data analysis.
* Suggestion: Add a note to departments that they are required to assess GE courses on all campuses where the course is offered. Add a text box for departments to explain why they have not performed assessment on a campus if they need to.
* Suggestion: We should discuss best practices recommendations for departments on how to handle assessment of courses across multiple campuses. Without direction, this can easily become a burden on faculty.
* Suggestion: Redesign the sample rubrics that are provided in the Qualtrics survey. They are difficult to read. The text of each rubric square is broken up.
* Suggestion: Provide a suggestion of approximately 250 words for the indirect method summary.
* The Panel will continue their discussion of Qualtrics at the next Panel meeting.