ASCC Assessment Panel

Approved Minutes

Monday, January 10, 2020 9:30am-11:00am

105 Bricker Hall

ATTENDEES: Giusti, Jenkins, Lam, Oldroyd, Rush, Samuels

1. Approval of 11-6-19 minutes

* Samuels, Rush, **unanimously approved**

1. Review GE assessment reports:
   1. Linguistics 2051

* The report is easy to understand and clearly communicates what the department did, how the students performed, and what the department will do with the information.
* Recommendation: It is unclear if the quizzes used for assessment counted as a grade. The panel recommends using graded assignments so students are incentivized to perform their best.
* The Panel commends the department’s recognition of the discrepancy on the performance between semesters and their efforts to address the issue. Using an assessment coordinator is a good method for producing uniform assessment.
* Recommendation: Using indirect assessment may give more insight into the reasons for the discrepancies between the sections.
* Recommendation: It seems that students may have a higher level of mastery of the questions labeled “advanced.” Consider revising the questions or the labels.
* Recommendation: The rubric provided on the final page of the appendix is not clear to the panel. Consider using a clearer rubric or providing more context for the panel to interpret the rubric for future reports.
  1. Communication 1100 and Communication 1101
* The Panel was impressed by the detail and rigor of the reports, but the panel was concerned that the department may have invested more time and resources than necessary. These reports drew attention to the need for best practices for assessment so departments do not go beyond what is necessary.
  + - For future reports, the panel recommends reducing the number of assessment methods used for each section and using a broader sample (e.g. assessing regional campuses). Reports should include data from regional campus offerings.
* Recommendation: If a rubric was used to evaluate the written assignment, the panel recommends providing this in an appendix on future reports.
  + Recommendation: Consolidating the data on future reports could help the panel interpret it in the future (e.g. average level of achievement per section for each ELO).
* Recommendation: The report mentioned concerns over security issues with testing. The department may want to consider using OSU’s proctoring resources, if they are not already doing so. <https://online.osu.edu/proctoring>
  1. Classics 1101
* The report is well-done overall. The data is clear, the methods of assessment are simple, and the “closing the loop” is informative.
* This is a good example of the usefulness of indirect assessment, which shows a discrepancy between student achievement and perception of achievement. The department discusses how they will address this in the “closing the loop” sections.
* Recommendation: The direct and indirect assessment results are labeled as questions. It could be clearer if the questions were labeled with the associated ELO (e.g. “Question 1 – Literature ELO 1”).