

#2. Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment:

Student Outcomes – Gen Ed

Department: Health and Human Performance Date: 5/12/17

Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Vicki Boye, Jen Janousek, Patti Jensen, Chris Luther, Nolan Harms

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).*
Data was analyzed using two rubrics. Rubric 1 was used to assess individual knowledge. Rubric 2 was used to assess a collaborative class video project.

Summary of RESULTS*:

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

Can the student communicate the rules and regulations of the sport of racquetball?

2). *Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.*

Success for assessment was defined as 80% of the students achieving a score of B or better on the post quiz/exam. Analysis shows that 100% of 12 participants scored B or better.

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

By definition of the assessment rubric, a B is categorized as "basic" to "proficient" application of content knowledge. Therefore, based on the summary of the assessment results, it is concluded that the transfer of content knowledge was successful and the student outcome(s) of being able to communicate that knowledge was/were met.

4). *Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)* The individual rubric encompasses more outcomes than what is needed to address the specified question. The rubric may need modification.

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 following the May 2017 Faculty/Staff seminar.

Who were results shared with? (List names): Vicki Boye, Jen Janousek, Patti Jensen, Chris Luther, Nolan Harms

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?*

As a result of the defined assessment measure being met by 100% of the students, no additional action is needed.

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

N/A

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).* While there is no action item defined, there has proven to be a need for more sections of this course, while the reality is we are having to reduce the number of offerings. With a lack of on-site courts and the rental fees growing too large, it is recommended to build on-campus racquetball courts.

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? Health and Human Performance will look at assessing other activity courses in the future to determine if the assessed student outcome(s) will see similar success across the departmental course offerings.

**Submitted by: Nolan Harms
5/16/17**

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date):

Department Chair notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: 5/16/17 - chair encourage to continue discussion of impact of adding courts on enrollment and program outcomes.

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