

#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: 5/12/17

Members involved with analysis of artifacts: B. Moore, E. Lamm, G. Haley, P. Koprince, L. ZumHofe, L. Ashby

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 collected from two assignments via two upper level ECTA classes--CTA 333 Intercultural Communication and Eng 384 World Literature III. Instructors assessed and collected scores once the assignments were turned in and used the departmental rubric for scoring. We focused assessment on the scores from one category -- The definition and use of a theory.

Summary of RESULTS*:

1). *Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):*

Students will be able to summarize and use a theory relevant to their area of study in an assignment. 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.*

We received data from Pete for CTA 333 (42 artifacts assessed) and from Gabe for Eng 384 (23 artifacts assessed). Combined, there were 65 artifacts assessed. 28 received a four (highest) ranking on the rubric. 26 received a three ranking. 8 received a two ranking. 3 received a one ranking. None of the artifacts ranked as zero.

Using the combined pool of 65 artifacts and the combined rankings, 43 percent scored 4. 40 percent scored 3. 12 percent scored 2. 4 percent scored 1. The assessment plan indicated a goal that 75% of the artifacts would score 3 or higher. 83% of the artifacts received a score of 3 or higher.

3). **INTERPRETATION*** - *Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*

We surpassed the achievement goal and noted that our students were able to effectively explain and analyze a theory.

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: 5/12/17

How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) met as a department

Who were results shared with? (List names): Moore, Lamm, Haley, Koprince, ZumHofe, Ashby

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?*

We were satisfied with the results of assessment. No action is required.

2. **IMPACT***- *What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?*

None.

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? We want to assess our outcome regarding professional presentation (resumes and portfolios) because this is an outcome that we have not recently assessed.

**Submitted by: Laurie ZumHofe
(date): 05/16/17**

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee

Department Chair notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 5/16/17