ASCC Assessment Panel

Approved Minutes

Wednesday, November 18, 2020 9:00am-10:30am

CarmenZoom

ATTENDEES: Kusaka, Jenkins, Lam, Miriti, Oldroyd, Putikka, Samuels, Vankeerbergen

1. Discussion of GE assessment
* The Assessment Panel usually reviews three types of reports: Course sets (a sample of courses from certain categories), departmental reports, new GE courses
	+ The Panel has not requested departmental reports or course since the GE revision process started. All GE categories were reviewed through the course sets and departmental reports over the past seven years, and the Panel did not want to start the process over to have it interrupted by implementation.
	+ There is little enthusiasm for doing GE assessment right now. COVID and the new GE implementation have placed many burdens on faculty.
* Pok-sang Lam, Maria Miriti, Bernadette Vankeerbergen, Alan Kalish, Meg Daly and David Horn recently met to discuss GE assessment.
	+ Discussed assessment under the current GE, such as what is assessed, how it is managed, and how formal modifications occur.
	+ Also discussed how to manage the Assessment Panel going forward. There are two main considerations:
		- What work the Assessment Panel will do for the remainder of the academic year. The Panel can request outstanding reports, help with curriculum review, etc.
		- What the Assessment Panel will look like under the new GE. Assessment plans will not be part of course submissions anymore. The Assessment Panel will still evaluate reports. The Assessment Panel could help in developing rubrics and planning assessment under the new GE.
* Assessment plans for GE course change requests: It used to be that the only time an assessment plan was requested was during the submission of a new course (for courses created 2014 and on). For most existing GE courses, there is no plan in place when course set reports or departmental reports are requested. The curriculum panels started asking for an assessment plan when a course was revised (e.g. change in course content, DL requests, etc.) to try to catch older GE courses as they came through. We are still asking for assessment plans for courses that come through with these changes, including the large number of DL requests being made because of COVID. Many courses never had an assessment plan, or the plan was lost. We are no longer asking for course set reports under this GE, so these existing GE courses will no longer be assessed. Asking for assessment plans is placing extra work on departments, who may be coming up with these plans from scratch.
	+ There was some opposition to changing this over the summer, but ASCC may not have had the necessary context to understand this change. Assessment reports under course sets are no longer being requested, which makes these updated assessment plans unnecessary.
	+ Panel member question: Is this something that ASCC would change?
		- Pok-sang Lam can raise this as an agenda item to be brought forward by the Assessment Panel at the next ASCC.
* The Assessment Panel needs to decide what kind of work they want to do for the remainder of the academic year. Will the Panel help to design rubrics, request more reports, help with curriculum approval, etc.?
	+ The Panel will still need to request reports for new GE courses. We need to decide if outstanding reports should be requested. There does not seem to be much interest from faculty in additional assessment.
	+ It’s possible that the Assessment Panel could help with the upcoming workload of approving GE courses under the new GE starting next spring. ASCC will start reviewing courses for the Foundations when they are submitted starting in January. This may happen informally for the remainder of the academic year. It might make sense for there to be formal changes to the panels in coming academic years (e.g. a panel for Race, Ethnic, and Gender Diversity).
		- The ASC Senate rules to not specify anything about the composition of ASCC panels. How ASCC does its work is up to ASCC, and it will not need to be approved by the ASC Senate.
	+ Decisions regarding assessment under the new GE have not been made yet. Planning for assessment in the new GE will likely start in the spring. The Assessment Panel will likely work with ULAC on this planning. For example, the Assessment Panel can help ULAC with development of rubrics. ULAC may be handling other things as the priority, but the Assessment Panel can start laying the foundation for assessment.
	+ Meg Daly discussed the expertise that the Assessment Panel can bring to the conversation. The Assessment Panel is familiar with common assessment issues, what methods work, what hasn’t worked, etc.
		- Comment: Providing information and assisting in rubric development sounds like something useful that can be done by the Panel. Should we be thinking about rubric design now or will this be something we give input on to ULAC?
			* Going forward, the Panel should coordinate with Meg Daly and ULAC. Maria Miriti and George Rush are on ULAC.
	+ What the Assessment Panel does specifically will likely be determined going forward (e.g. how many courses are actually received in the spring, the timeline for assessment implementation, etc.). The situation is fluid.
	+ No matter what, it’s important that the Assessment Panel remains active while these things are being decided. It’s easy for another body, like ULAC, to take the lead on things. It’s important that the Panel remain active and keep in contact with ULAC.
* New GE Assessment will be done collaboratively between ULAC-GE and ASCC. Assessment will be rubric based. Faculty teaching GE courses will collaborate to create rubrics. The instructor will decide the method of assessment and evaluate using the rubric. Departments will not submit an assessment plan when the course is approved for GE status.
	+ Panel member comment: This method of assessment may not be effective. Faculty will be planning assessment at the last minute rather than building assessment into the course. This will leave faculty scrambling to gather the data and will create issues of uncertainty around reporting.
		- This is something that should be communicated with ULAC and Meg Daly while planning for assessment is happening.
		- The Panel should think about what works well and what does not work about the current method of assessment and communicate that with ULAC.
	+ The proposal for the new GE includes category-level assessment. This Panel has traditionally done course assessment, somewhat successfully. Course assessment is not in the new model. We may want to look at the benefits of taking a detailed look at a subset of courses.
		- This may not be welcomed by ULAC, but it should still be discussed with them before they implement a model of assessment that is more broad but potentially superficial.
		- Doing aggregative assessment, like what is planned, will allow for better program assessment (e.g. finding issues with ELOs, etc.), but the plan for how to do this is not fully decided yet.
* Panel member question: Can we invite Meg Daly and Alan Kalish to come to the meeting to discuss assessment in a less speculative way. The Panel is looking for a positive way to contribute and having more information may give the Panel insights into how they can contribute.
	+ Meg Daly and Alan Kalish will be invited to a meeting in the Spring to discuss assessment.