**ASCC GE Assessment Panel**

Approved Minutes

Friday, January 20, 2012 1:00 -2:30 PM

110 Denney Hall

ATTENDEES: Carlson, Fink, Guatelli-Steinberg, Hetherington, Hogle, Jenkins, Masters, Rake, Soundarajan, Vankeerbergen.

AGENDA:

1. Approval of 1-6-12 minutes

* Masters, Hetherington, unanimously approved

1. Valerie Rake to present prototype of GE course/category level assessment using Carmen.

* Carmen is able to provide a link for GE Assessment
* We can fish out data to identify GEC courses through SIS to identify who is in which GE course.
* Carmen Tutorial of GE Assessment
  + A link is provided on Carmen’s homepage (rather than course page in case instructor does not use Carmen) that students will see. This becomes active at the end of the quarter.
  + The text of the survey comes from GEC assessment materials and could be editable (for example, Arts and Sciences Curriculum and Assessment Services, not the individual faculty). The question is who exactly will control this?
  + It would not be used for specific courses. It would be used for all GE categories.
    - Comment that the goal here is specifically for the category level to see if we are meeting the goals and objectives of the GE category
  + Should it be tacked on to the SEI?
    - This is a policy question
    - Student response rates to SEI are low (about 25%)
    - May have less push back if added to SEI
  + Concern about the number of students actually using Carmen
    - There is no consequence or buy in
  + Data Table portion of Carmen Tutorial
    - What data do you want to capture and who gets that data?
  + Breaking the category into individual courses
    - Comment that this should be used to improve courses which in effect will improve the GE categories and so we should be able to access results on individual courses
    - Some may not want their courses to be assessed in this way. Professors may object to where there may be push back. Could be used to improve teaching but there is also fear that there will be record affecting things such as tenure.
    - There is a need to protect people’s privacy (faculty concerns) but how are we going to be using it? If you don’t collect the data you don’t know what’s not working. A couple of courses just may not be good but we will not know without collecting the data.
    - The last assessment collection process went pretty smoothly. There were questions/concerns from faculty but this did not seem to affect the overall collection process.
      * Suggestion: give professors the opportunity to “opt out.” This will still contribute to category level assessment data
    - This could be a Senate decision.
    - Maybe we should look at standard deviation. A message could go out to all departments that teach these courses so we are not pointing fingers.
      * This would evaluate course level and not individual instructors
      * This would allow us to see if certain departments who have courses that are intended to fulfill the history GE requirement, for example, may not be as successful as the history department
    - Panel will be ready to recommend that data is collected at the course level.
  + If it is worth pursuing by the Assessment Panel, considering all questions, we can start having meetings with the development team. This would be an iterative process. A deadline would need to be created in order for team to work it into other projects.
    - This is not to be implemented by Fall due to timeframe
    - The question is, if we need to do assessment, what’s the best way to do it? (We think this is the best way)
    - This is the least intrusive way.
  + Looking ahead, we have to actually collect the data. Ultimately there has to be an internal buy-in.
    - How do we foster a culture of assessment? Faculty think that it is silly especially the arts and humanities that do not seek external accreditation. The more fully it is integrated into coursework the more successful it will be.
  + Carmen is used by students, not creating additional work for instructors making it more attractive.
  + Indirect assessments are opinions of students. Direct Assessment is can you answer these questions (direct assessment should be in exams, papers by teachers)
    - Carmen is better for indirect assessment.
* Panel wants to move forward with Carmen assessment. It will be taken to the body of ASCC where Debbie will present during panel report and at future ASCC meeting Valerie Rake could present Carmen Assessment Tutorial. The ASCC will move forward and wait for ULAC in spring for them to weigh in and agree with ASCC.

1. Review and discuss Education Abroad GE course submission requirements
   * + ULAC: Should we even make study abroad a GE?
       - We need to distinguish between academically based vs. “experiencing the country.” There is a need to look at study abroad courses to see if they really are GE.
     + Use education abroad & service learning as pilot categories for assessment
2. Review and discuss Education Abroad proposed reflection paper assignment for use in GE course/category level assessment
   * This is for category level assessment
   * Paragraph added under #3 on “Revised Education Abroad” document introduces a reflection paper
     + Is this paper direct or indirect assessment?
       - Seems to be more of a direct assessment by grading student paper
       - Indirectly we are grading them on their abilities to express their thoughts through writing yet they may have achieved the expected learning outcomes of education abroad but cannot express themselves in that format.
3. Discussion: In submitting courses for GE approval, we ask the proposer to submit an assessment plan, but do not explain what should be included in an assessment plan. Should we do so? And, if so, what should we request?

* What do we want to see in an Assessment plan?
  + What activities will the student engage in that can be measured and how will you evaluate these GE outcomes?
  + Please provide examples of embedded questions going to be used.
  + We need to explain direct vs. indirect assessment
  + How will you use the data to improve your course?
  + What are the criteria for achieving those outcomes? Ex. 70% of students will get this question correct.
  + We could put these general questions in all of the GE requirements
    - Models will be useful for instructors as well as for Panels to look at

1. Discuss GE learning outcomes and develop plan for making revisions, if deemed necessary

* North Carolina State & University of Minnesota Models do not seem to be much different from OSU
* Does OSU have too many expected learning outcomes?
  + If there are too many ELO’s it will be harder to assess
  + Comment: Oral Communication should be part of GE
    - It is in ELO’s in second writing (Needs to be reviewed)
* Assessment Panel will tweak ELO’s of GE and take to ASCC