

#2. Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment:
Student Outcomes – Gen Ed

To be completed by Departments and submitted to the Black Board assessment site.

Department: Education

Date: May 28, 2015

See Undergraduate Program Outcomes Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes- Gen Eds for: a) Learning Outcome, b) Background, C) Question, D) Methodology

Analysis of Artifacts

1)Performance Criteria: How was data analyzed? (Attach Rubrics/scoring tools if used).

Student responses were evaluated on the basis of percent correct. Questions were divided into three major categories: Experience (questions 1-5), Program Info (questions 8-21) and Content (Questions 22-25. Additional questions (6,7, 26-29) were used to generate information about student planning and comments about the program.

Student Scores

	Field Exp. (5 pts)	Program Info (14 pts)	Content (3 pts)	Total (22 pts)
Average	4.36	13.68	2.88	94%
Range	0-5	11-14	1-3	77%-100%
<u>Number of Participants with scores of 90% or better (n=33)</u>				
	13	32	29	27

Correlations tested

Total Score/Q 26: Do you plan to continue your studies in education? $r = .062$

Program Info Score/Q26: Do you plan to continue your studies in education? $r = .262 (p > .90)$

Total score/Q 27: Did the experiences or content of the ED101: Teaching as a Profession have a role in this decision? $r = .328 (p > .95)$

Examination of the scores shows that 82% (n=27) students attained the 90% benchmark set in the original assessment plan. Subscores based on answers from the Shadowing Day Field Experience (Field Exp.= 4.36/5) and from content from class discussion and online postings (Content = 2.88/3) indicate that these scores were somewhat lower than questions about program offerings included in Concordia's education program (Program Info=13.68/14).

The correlations examined estimated the relatedness between the total score on the exam with the student plans to continue in education ($r = .062$), the score on program information and the student's plans to continue in education ($r = .262, (p > .90)$) and whether or not the experiences and content of Ed 101 had a role in the decision ($r = .328, (p > .95)$). Only one of these correlations met the $p > .95$ standard set in the proposal.

Interpretation: Discuss how the results answer the assessment question.

The average overall score of 94% clearly indicates that students complete EDUC 101 with substantial accurate information about the teaching profession and Concordia's potential role in helping the student develop into a professional educator. While correlations linking program persistence with test scores do not show a strong relationship, student comments also collected in the assessment indicate that the class is a strong positive influence for many students either in helping them make a decision to teach or not, or in confirming the decision that they have already made before the start of the class.

Sharing of Results: The information was discussed at our June assessment meeting. It has also been discussed among ED101 instructors and the assessment lead.

ED101 Instructors: B. Pester, B. Robson, Assessment Lead, B. Tonjes.

Faculty Assessment meeting: B. Tonjes, R. Bork, A. Geidel, S. Opfer, K. Nugent, A. Oliver, J. Uffelman, V. Anderson.

Discussion of results

Action: The information gained in this project gives direct evidence that ED101 is doing what we expect it to do. We do not believe that the data point to any needed changes. We will keep doing what we have been doing.

Impact: Operating under the basic assumption that the changes in our student body's collective attitudes and advance knowledge are incremental, continuing the current course with incremental adjustments will mean that professors need to use their judgment in adjusting topics and pedagogy to meet the needs of the students, as they have done in the past. This is an impact that will not be noticed by the students in the course and is part of the routine for professors teaching the class.

Budget Implications: There are none.