Minutes from Assessment meeting

February 14, 2020

Feedback from Focus Groups:

1. We have things to fix and improve on.
2. Ask:
	1. What are we really going after?
	2. How well can we gauge this?
	3. If Joe doesn’t get the question, neither will the students.
3. The students don’t really understand the questions.
4. Our two-pronged approach:
	1. Improve the instrument – pick three questions to improve upon
	2. Meet in the fall to improve our teaching
5. It might be time to detach the dispositions from the pre-and-post-tests. Think of new ways to do these assessments.
6. Why HUM 2235 is low: maybe something in the class is already known to the students who take it.
7. This data represents the fall semester.
8. What success looks like in the numbers: 20% is the best we’ll get (Joe says).
9. One challenge: wanting them to understand and appreciate a variety of approaches/perspectives while also presenting that some ideas/perspectives are better than others.
10. One potential path forward: add specificity to the questions. For example, we could create multiple questions to assess the same issue, e.g., “I find value in understanding a variety of perspectives on X” and then in the next question “Y,” “Z,” etc. (where X is, e.g., abortion, and Y is the death penalty, etc.)
	1. Issues in HUM: gender/sexuality, politics/class, race/ethnicity, religion
	2. Issues in PHIL: TBD. We’ll look at this in our April meeting (look at questions ahead of time to refresh and be ready to identify changes in questions. Bring suggestions to the meeting)