**#2. Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment:  Student Outcomes**

To be completed by Departments and submitted by the Department Chair to the Assessment Blackboard Site.

|  |
| --- |
| **Department:  ECTA                                                            Date:  May 26, 2016** |
| **Members involved with analysis of artifacts:  Dr. Pete Koprince, Dr. Laurie Zum Hofe** |
| **See #1 Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes for:** *a) Student Outcome; b) Background; c) Question(s); d) Methodology* |
| **Analysis of artifacts:**  *1).* ***PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).*  The data was analyzed using the attached rubric. Scores were compiled using the “Summary/Definition of a Theory” category. |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:**  *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):*  Can students effectively communicate the definition and use of a theory within their discipline?  *2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.*  72% of students scored a 4 on the rubric, demonstrating “a thorough understanding of the theory and its definition.”  28% of students scored a 3 on the rubric, demonstrating “knowledge related to the theory and its definition.”  We were very encouraged by these results.  *3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*  With 100% of the students assessed scoring a 3 o 4 on the 4 point rubric, the question can be answered in the affirmative.  *4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*)  None. |
| **Sharing of Results:**  *When were results shared? Date:* May 31, 2016  *How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* Emailed to departmental members involved  *Who were results shared with? (List names):*  Dr. Laurie Zum Hofe, Dr. Lisa Ashby, Dr. Pete Koprince, Dr. Gabriel Haley, Dr. Erica Lamm, Prof. Tobin Beck, Prof. Bryan Moore, Dr. Dan Thurber |
| **Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:**  *1.* **ACTION\*-** *How will what the department learned from the assessment impact the teaching process/course/program etc. in your department starting the next academic year?*  Since students were successful with the summary and definition of a theory, it would be interesting to note how that theory would be utilized and applied in a situation. Taking this component to the next level, especially in an upper level setting, would help assess how students are applying summaries and definitions to real-life and real-work scenarios.  *2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?*    Now that students have the terms and ideas of theories in mind, assessing how they apply these ideas will lend to more creative and complex thinking not just in the classroom, but also in their future professional scenarios.  *3.* **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS** – *Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the* **ACTION\*** (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course).             None. |
| ***If action is taken – it is recommended that the same learning outcome and assessment plan be used for a second assessment cycle.*** |
| ***What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future?***  **Can students effectively analyze/use a theory within the context of a discipline?** |
|  |
| **Submitted by: Dr. Laurie Zum Hofe                                Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date):      6/24/16** |
| **Department Chair notified/additional action needed:     na**  **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:       na**  **Approved & Posted to Assessment site:      6/24/16** |