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

**Student Outcomes – Gen Ed**

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

|  |
| --- |
| **Department:** **Mathematics Date:** **5/15/2015** |
| **Members involved with analysis of artifacts:** **Brian Albright, Ed Reinke, John Snow** |
| **See Undergraduate Program Outcome Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes – Gen Eds for:** a) Learning Outcome; b) Background; c) Question(s); d) Methodology |
| **Analysis of artifacts:**  *1****). PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).*  A four point rubric was applied to each of the outcomes. The four categories are Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Needs Improvement and Unacceptable. |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:**  *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):*  Are students able to apply statistical principles to test hypotheses?  *2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional*.  Students do better at calculating the test statistic than stating the hypotheses. Stating the conclusion is their weakest skill.  *3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*  Our goal was that 80% of students would meet or exceed expectations. The results fell just below this target. On the three criteria in the rubric the percentage of students who met or exceeded expectations was 68%, 72% and 80% respectively.  4). *Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*) Different instructors required different levels of interpretation of the results from the hypotheses tests. |
| **Sharing of Results:**  *When were results shared? Date*: 5/15/2015  *How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* met as department and through electronic communication  *Who were results shared with? (List names):* Brian Albright, Ed Reinke, John Snow, Kent Einspahr, Russell Mosemann, Don Sylwester |
| **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?*  Greater emphasis will be placed on stating hypotheses and making conclusions. More time in class will be spent discussing and practicing these two skills. We as a department will also discuss the issue of uniformity of expectations across all sections of the course.  *2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?*  A higher percentage of the students will at least meet expectations. We will continue to have as our goal that a minimum of 80% of the students will meet or exceed expectations in all sections of the course. The same scoring rubric will be used next year.  *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 |
|  |
| ***What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future?*** **We will continue to assess the same outcome.** |
|  |
| **Submitted by:** **Edward Reinke Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 5/15/15 & 7/15** |
| **Department Chair notified/additional action needed: 5/15/15 Revisions Accepted: 5/26/15**  **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na**  **Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 7/15** |